

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 483

IR 009 362

TITLE Education for the Research Library Professional.
Minutes of the Ninety-Seventh Meeting, October 15-16,
1980 in Arlington, Virginia.

INSTITUTION Association of Research Libraries, Washington,
D.C.

PUB DATE Oct 80

NOTE 108p.

AVAILABLE FROM Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire
Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036 (\$5.00/issue for
members; \$7.50/issue for non-members).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; *Librarians; Library
Associations; *Library Education; Library Personnel;
Professional Education; Professional Training;
*Research Libraries

ABSTRACT

These proceedings of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) meeting on the education of research library personnel contain the following papers: The Conant Report and Its Implications for Academic and Research Libraries, by Ralph W. Conant; Library Education--State-of-the-Art, by Robert O. Stueart; Professional Education and Training--A New CLR Program, by Warren J. Haas; and Library Education--The Director's Point of View, by Margot B. McBurney. Discussion and comments from the floor follow the papers. Details of the business meeting are provided, and appendices include various ARL committee reports and membership data. (FM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 202483

IR 009362



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPR-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Education for the Research Library Professional

Minutes

of the

Ninety-Seventh

Meeting

October 15-16, 1980
Arlington, Va.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Mandel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1981
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D.C.

Minutes of the meetings of the Association of Research Libraries are published semiannually by the Association, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Price: ARL Members, \$10.00 per year, \$5.00 an issue
Nonmembers, \$15.00 per year, \$7.50 an issue

Editor: Nicola Daval
Association of Research Libraries

Association of Research Libraries

Minutes of the meeting. 1st-
Dec. 1932-
[Princeton, N.J., etc.]
v. 28 cm.

Meetings are numbered irregularly: 9th-10th, 12th called
respectively: 10th-11th, 13th.

INDEXES:

Subject index.

1st-42d, Dec. 1932-Jan. 1954. 1 v.

Z673.A84

59-30046

Library of Congress

[]

Printed in U.S.A.

ISSN 0044-9652

These Minutes are printed on a stable and enduring paper.

CONTENTS

	Page
Opening	1
 THE CONANT REPORT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES	
Ralph W. Conant	2
 LIBRARY EDUCATION — STATE-OF-THE-ART	
Robert D. Stueart	6
 PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING: A NEW CLR PROGRAM	
Warren J. Haas	17
DISCUSSION	22
 LIBRARY EDUCATION: THE DIRECTOR'S POINT OF VIEW	
Margot B. McBurney	28
DISCUSSION	32
 BUSINESS MEETING	
Election of Board Members	36
Report of the Task Force on Bibliographic Control	36
Report on the Universal Serials and Book Exchange	38
Report on the ARL Bibliographic Control of Materials in Microform Project	39
Report of the Office of Management Studies (with comments by Ms. Darling)	45
Report of the Committee on a National Periodicals System	48
Report on the Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue (by Henry Snyder)	52
Report of the Interim Executive Director (with comments by Ms. Child, Mr. Goodwell, and Mr. Jones)	58
Report of the ARL President	66
 APPENDICES	
A. Report of the Committee on ARL Statistics	70
B. Report of the ARL Committee on a National Periodicals System	71
C. Report of the ARL Committee on Interlibrary Loan	74
D. Report of the ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control	76
E. Report of the ARL Task Force on National Library Network Development ..	77
F. Report on the CONSER Project	78
G. Attendance at the 97th Membership Meeting	86
Member institutions	
Name Index for Members	
Guests and Staff	
H. Officers, Board of Directors, Committees, and Task Forces of the Association	94
I. Membership of the Association of Research Libraries	99

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 97th Meeting

Connie Dunlap, Presiding

The Ninety-seventh Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries convened at the Arlington Hyatt Hotel, Arlington, Virginia, on October 15-16, 1980.

President Connie Dunlap opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing both the new and alternate representatives attending their first ARL meeting and the guests of the Association.

President Dunlap then turned the program over to Jay K. Luckner, who introduced the morning's speakers.

THE CONANT REPORT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR
ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Ralph W. Conant

Unity College

MR. LUCKER: The title of this morning's program is "Education for the Research Library Professional." We have three speakers whom I will introduce as they are about to speak. Following the three speakers, we will have an opportunity for questions and comments from the floor. After the coffee break, Margot McBurney, the chair of the ARL Task Force on Library Education, will present the results of the survey conducted by the task force earlier this year and we will have some general discussion on those issues. We have invited the speakers to stay with us through the rest of the program to answer questions and to make additional comments.

Our first speaker is Ralph Conant, who is President of Unity College in Unity, Maine. He has also been President of Shimer College in Mount Carroll, Illinois. From 1969 to 1975, he was the founding President of the Southwest Center for Urban Research in Houston, a consortium of Rice University, University of Houston, Texas Southern University, Baylor College of Medicine, and the University of Texas School of Public Health. He has also been associated with, among other institutions, Brandeis University, the Joint Center for Urban Studies at Harvard and MIT, and the University of Denver. Mr. Conant is the author of a number of books, including The Metropolitan Library, edited with Kathleen Moltz, and The Public Library in the City. His most recent work is The Conant Report: A Study of the Education of Librarians.

MR. CONANT: Just a year after I began the study which resulted in my report on library education, I was speaking to a consortium at the University of Kentucky on library matters, and in the course of my comments I made the imprudent remark that the accreditation process in library education is a political process. That remark got back to the American Library Association's Committee on Accreditation very, very rapidly, and shortly I got a call from some folks at ALA in which they strongly suggested that I not make any more public statements during the course of the study. So this is my first outing since the book was published. Ironically, of the constituencies we interviewed in the course of the study, the group most critical of library education was the academic and research librarians. It is perhaps appropriate that this group be the first to discuss the results of the study.

I asked three questions which set the framework of the study. First, what is the function of professional education? Second, what approaches best serve the functions of professional education? Finally, what changes, if any, are needed in the present system of library education to make possible such approaches?

I think a fundamental function of any professional educational education system would be the Lewin's "gatekeeper" function; some responsible group in the profession must stand at the gates and determine who gets into the profession. I believe it is proper for the educators to perform this function to ensure that the type and quality of personnel coming into the profession sets the tone for the profession as well as its competence and long-range goals in the service of society.

The second function of professional education is instruction in the work and methods of the profession. This is basic and needs no elaboration here.

The third function is to provide and foster leadership in the profession. Educators must be the intellectual vanguard and innovators of the profession. Library school faculty, as in any professional school, are models to their students: the initial models of the future professionals. So it is crucial that they conduct themselves in their curricula as models for the future careers of their students. Educators should provide the substance of beneficial change and advancement in the profession, specifically in the production of new knowledge — which means research — in the advancement of the technology of the profession. Practically every professional school performs this function and probably no profession needs to pay more attention to advancements in technology and opportunities for adaptations of technology and techniques that make the great libraries great and small libraries and library systems operate responsively.

A fourth and critically important function is to provide for the continuing education of professionals.

The final chapter in the study looks closely at the question of what approaches in professional education would best serve these functions.

There must be appropriate screening mechanisms for entry to the profession. One common screening method that library education has deliberately avoided is the introduction of some introductory courses at the undergraduate level. I know it is a tradition in librarianship that maximum time at the undergraduate level ought to be spent in the acquisition of broad knowledge, because the business of librarianship is knowledge. I agree with the reasoning that librarians be broadly educated before they arrive in professional school. But there is an argument to be made, and is made by a minority in library education, that some introductory courses ought to be offered at the undergraduate level. A few universities in which library schools are situated do just that, but not very many. In view of the widening scope of library education and the need to cover ever broader areas at the graduate level, it would be helpful to get some of the introductory work done at the advanced stages of undergraduate education. Also, an important function to be served by offering some introductory courses at the undergraduate level is the opportunity before graduate school for the profession to identify, select, and encourage the best and the brightest students for professional training. I think it is a mistake to leave the "gatekeeper" function entirely at the graduate level.

Also, I believe it is important in the education of any professionals to have an adequate period of socialization to their profession. When a recruit enters a profession, there needs to be a period of exposure, of ferment, of being under the influence of the best models in the profession. In the current mode of library education in the United States, the typical period of one academic year to 12 months is not a period that is adequate for the purpose of socialization. There needs to be a somewhat longer period of exposure to the educators who are the models and the intellectual leaders in the field. In my interviews of the faculty members of library schools selected for my study, the inadequate period of time students spent in professional training was one of the areas that bothered the faculty members most. Most faculty I interviewed said they did not have enough time with their students; they did not feel that their students were in the formal educational

process long enough. The time spent in formal professional training should be regarded as one of the most important periods in the development of prospective new professionals.

Professional education must attend to the need for a thorough grounding in fundamentals. This is what library schools really do try to do, except that most of the programs are forced to cover not just the fundamentals but also a great deal of elementary material. In the area of academic librarianship where specializations are crucial, the typical period of library training is too short to handle both the thorough grounding in the fundamentals and a specialization. In the privacy of this room, I would say the phrase "cram course" is appropriate. I do not mean that as a put-down of library education. We are, after all, reviewing library education to determine what adjustments are needed. The feeling on the part of many of the students we interviewed in the study was that they were exposed to too much material in too short a time. From the point of view of the student, the period of exposure to fundamentals was not too short, but too mixed up with other important objectives of library education.

High competence in the basic practices is crucial. Mastery, a true mastery, of the methods, techniques, and tools of the profession is crucial, and mastery of a specialization has become increasingly important. Library schools make the effort to provide the opportunities for mastery as a matter of priority. But, again, the period of time that the typical student is in the typical program is too short for true mastery. Mastery of a specialization has become increasingly important.

Above all the other goals of professional education is that of encouraging and nurturing the skills of thinking and problem solving. Many of the graduate library programs place too much emphasis on practice and memorization and not enough on concepts and theory. Training the student to think and to problem-solve is the key to professional training and time spent in training is of the essence in that process.

What are some of the changes needed to make possible these approaches? In the interest of the allotted time I will just list some of the things discussed in the study.

1. Separate professional from subprofessional training. I deliberately list this point as number one because I think it is very important. Most of the graduate library schools do not make this separation, although many claim to do so. It is a difficult separation. The spectrum of the needs in the field is very wide as are personnel needs in the field. Also, the spectrum of interests among students is very wide. Graduate library programs tend to respond to the variety of demands both of the employees and the students in the schools. Nevertheless, the division should be made — a clear training program for subprofessionals versus a clear training program for the future professionals. The educational requirements of these two groups are very different.
2. Adapt the length of the programs to the requirements of specific educational and training objectives. I discussed at length in my study one-year versus two-year programs. There can be no arbitrary period. There must be an adaptation according to the objectives of

the particular professional education program to which each of the graduate programs address themselves.

3. Internships must be integral to every program, partly as an aspect of the needed socialization process. The medical school model might be appropriate for the graduate library schools. I know very well why the library schools minimize the internship. Partly it is a matter of time; partly it is a matter of difficulties in management. But it simply must happen. An aspect of the approach to the development of internships should be a closer relationship between the libraries in the universities that train library students and the library schools. But these are not the only libraries that must be brought into the picture. All types of libraries must be sought out for internships.
4. Recruitment and screening via undergraduate courses.
5. Emphasis on the intellectual level of training, primarily for the professional level; an appropriate mix of both theory and practice in instructional methods is essential to effective professional training. Some schools achieve this mix very well, but many, in the belief that theory is more important and possibly more university-like, ignore the practice. Other schools do the opposite. A balance between theory and practice is essential to the training of professionals.
6. Deliberate use of interdisciplinary approaches to instruction. This is a crucial point. No graduate library school should try to do everything in one program. Many library schools do have interdisciplinary encouragement in their catalogues. But I discovered in the interviews of faculty and students that the interdisciplinary work is not aggressively encouraged. This is absolutely necessary, especially for the future research librarian. Business management practices, sociology, planning — there is just a whole spectrum of relevant materials at a good university. The ideal library school ought to be in a first-rate university and ought to reach out in various directions within that university.

I am just going to say briefly that accreditation is an important key to reform, and leadership is an important key to reform. The role of professional education should be seen as strategic to the ongoing process of change in librarianship. I have suggested in the conclusions of the study some possible mechanisms for change. If change were to occur from the top in the library profession, then some kind of national forum for replanning and rethinking library education should be adopted. I do believe that one strategy could be the deliberate development of a model library school.

LIBRARY EDUCATION — STATE-OF-THE-ART

Robert D. Stueart

Simmons College

MR. LUCKER: Our second speaker is Robert Stueart, who is Dean and Professor of Library Science at Simmons College. He has also been associated with the Library School at the University of Denver, and was a visiting lecturer at the College of Librarianship in Wales. Dr. Stueart is no stranger to ARL libraries, having served in professional positions at Pennsylvania State University and the University of Colorado. He is the author of many works, including a bibliography of library management with John Eastlick, and Collection Development in Libraries, co-edited with George Miller, and he was editor, with Richard Johnson, of New Horizons for Academic Librarians, the proceedings of the 1978 ACRL National Conference.

MR. STUEART: I am honored to be here this morning to talk with you about the education for beginning academic/research librarians and I am delighted that you have chosen this very important topic for discussion. I remember a similar occasion several years ago when I participated on a panel with the Personnel Officers of Large Academic Library Discussion Groups and the deans and directors of library schools. I am hopeful that the dialogue begun then and continuing now will be ongoing and of mutual benefit. Let me assure you I am here today to listen as much as to speak, and I take the responsibility, along with my other decanal colleagues in this audience, to relate the discussions to a wider group of educators.

I do not believe that the issue facing us is whether or not there should be a preparation for academic/research librarians, but rather, how to make that preparation more effective. Such an effort involves factors internal to the schools — curriculum, students, and faculty — as well as external, by relating schooling to practice and to the profession.

For our discussions today, the first premise I would like to make is that the exploding mass of knowledge has made it impossible for us to continue the idea of learning things in anticipation of possible future use. Rather, we are now learning how to find information efficiently and effectively when the time comes. Traditional education has consisted of the transmission of knowledge and skills from the teacher to the student. Now education should be viewed as a process of the acquisition of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values by a learner with help from a facilitator or facilitators. The determination of what and how is made through negotiation — and there are many inputs which should be considered at this point, including faculty, student colleagues, employers, and other professionals. This input is aided by efforts such as those which I think will appear in the report of your Task Force on Library Education and through the work of advisory boards which many schools have comprising leaders from the profession. We can all think of other desirable inputs and I would like to talk about some of those later.

I should begin by saying that I agree with the adage: "If you teach a person what to learn you are preparing for the past; if you teach him how to learn then you are preparing for the future." We should be less concerned with the development of

specific work skills, which may become obsolete, and more concerned with learning how to acquire and organize knowledge which enables students to learn, unlearn, and relearn. Our students need to discipline their minds; they need to examine issues and trends rigorously and critically. Therefore, my second premise is that our function as library educators is not to impart a narrowly defined set of skills of the kind measured by examinations, but to define a set of criteria which individuals entering the profession ought to meet and to screen out those who do not measure up against such a yardstick. Our primary role is one of acculturation. We should always be in the position of identifying where, why, and how change is needed, and then acting as change agents in developing an intellectual orientation to skills and methods, both technical and behavioral. Our success is measured by the harmony of that educational process with the aims of the profession. This interdependence causes stress because each of us would like to control the structural position of the other. Criticism, in such a framework, is vitriolic and directed at issues involving means and seldom to fundamentals.

I am reminded of Houle's analysis back in 1967, when he wrote: "The voice of the aggrieved alumnus is always loud in the land, and, no matter what the profession, the burden of complaint is always the same. In the first five years after graduation, alumni say that they should have been taught more practical techniques. In the next five years, they say that they should have had more basic theory; in the tenth to fifteenth years they inform the faculty that they should have been taught more about administration or about their relations with their co-workers and subordinates. In the subsequent five years, they condemn the failure of their professors to put the profession in its larger historical, social, and economic contexts. After the twentieth year, they insist that they should have been given a broader orientation to all knowledge, scientific and humane. Sometime after that, they stop giving advice; the university has deteriorated so badly since they left that it is beyond hope."¹

I can assure you that we are not beyond hope and that we are striving very hard to separate the unessential from the essential knowledge necessary for a beginning professional to have. There is, of course, no uniform overall agreement among educators — just as there is no overall agreement among practicing professionals — as to what that magic formula is and how to accomplish it. But I cannot believe that our current formula is all that bad and that academic librarians in general are as negative about library education as a couple of quotes from the 60 academic librarians interviewed by Dr. Conant's team or the conclusion reached by the report might indicate. Specifically:

"For many years there has been no common understanding between academic librarians and educators as to what library schools should be doing in training programs for academic librarians."

"Relations between the academic libraries and the library schools, especially at the universities that have library schools, are often uneasy and somewhat remote. The estrangement is at the root of misunderstanding and mistrust."

"Agreement that the preparation of the average library school graduate does not relate closely to the principal professional skills needed in academic libraries."

"A prevalent view that most existing library education programs do not have the caliber of curriculum or faculty to prepare librarians with the depth of knowledge and the diverse expertise needed at professional levels in academic and research libraries."

I think that I can easily rebut some of those impressions by looking at what is happening in library education today, by examining the trends and current issues in that light, and I am happy to do that. I certainly am not naive enough to think that there is no criticism and that none is due. There is, and there should be. John Gardner reminds us that "Love without criticism brings stagnation, and criticism without love brings destruction. The swifter the pace of change, the more lovingly men care for and criticize their institutions to keep them intact within turbulent pastures."

Certainly the debate over structure, organization, philosophy, and curriculum goes on. What content best prepares for future needs and which is the best way of conveying it are the major issues. I would like to talk about three areas which relate to the "Standards for Accreditation" of the American Library Association and are most pertinent, I think, to any discussion of what we are doing and what you expect us to do. These remarks will basically address curriculum, students, and faculty, the last two only in passing and by way of background.

First, students in relation to the profession. I doubt that few, if any, of you would maintain that our current graduates are incompetent, therefore unemployable. Many of our students are bright, energetic, self-confident, committed individuals. Unfortunately, we have some who are not so committed, and one issue we face is how to correct that. I maintain that one of the fastest ways to address change is through the students who are coming into the profession. We must be able to continue to attract students with desirable qualities, and herein lies the rub. Obviously one fundamental factor is the appeal of the field as it is perceived by those making the occupational choice. We look to you for guidance and help in this regard, particularly in recommending potential students. Many students become interested in librarianship through their work in college and university libraries. Sadly, many of those with good potential have been discouraged from entering the profession because of the tight job market, a fact which has shrunk the pool of potential students but has not, itself, had an impact on the number of graduates. You are in a position to spot people with excellent potential for library careers. Some of you have recommended them but unfortunately, some who are not so good have also been recommended. We do sometimes have a problem in personality assessments in our admissions process — but you are well aware of the difficulty today in rejecting the academically qualified applicants for graduate study on the basis of personality. Fortunately, many schools still insist upon personal interviews and, contrary to rumors you may have heard, potential students are rejected.

Approximately one-fourth of those who are admitted have second masters degrees, 14 students in the Simmons program currently have Ph.D.'s. Few of these are dropouts from other professions. A few have gotten the word that academic or research libraries require a subject masters in addition to the library degree. Some of the really good ones go on to other programs or professions either after library school or after their first professional position. Anywhere from 20 to 30 percent of each library school's graduates are going into academic/research librarianship; about 20 percent have had academic library experience — and I do not mean as student

assistants — before they come into the programs. By the way, since 1970 the number of graduates has been reduced from around 9,000 per year to the current figure of around 5,000 per year. When one adds to that the figure from the 1970 Bureau of Labor Statistics which indicates that one-half of the librarians at that time were over 45 years of age, one might speculate about what will happen within the next ten to 15 years. You may be interested to know that job postings at my school for the first nine months of this year are up over the whole of last year by 130 percent. The pendulum may just be swinging, although it is too early to tell.

Finally, on the point of preparation in accredited programs, it should be clearly understood that none of the schools are training for nonprofessional positions. Articulation among degrees and programs, however, is an important topic which is a first priority for the Standing Committee on Library Education (SCOLE) of ALA and is a topic with which we are all concerned. Anyone wanting to give input to that concern might want to contact Margaret Myers, Director of ALA's Office for Library Personnel Resources.

Now to faculty. One sometimes hears comments about paucity of faculty with academic library contact and experience and with lack of experience in the newer technologies. I do not think this is true. Over one-half of the faculty in my school has had academic library experience, and my guess is that a similar ratio exists in other schools. The programs are further enriched by the use of practitioners as part-time faculty when regular faculty takes sabbaticals or leaves, and by the entry of recent practitioners into library education. There is a constant turnover in education, to the point that one graffiti expresses it very well: "Old deans never die, they just lose their faculties."

Academic/research library directors often join library education program faculties. As a matter of fact, so many former directors of academic libraries are now professors in library schools that I have heard remarks to the effect that faculties are inhabited by former directors who are tired, fired, retired, or wired with the right connection since they come with salaries oftentimes higher than that of the dean. Thumbing through the Directory of the Association of American Library Schools, one comes across the names of several former ARL directors who have made significant contributions both to academic librarianship and to library education: Vosper, Kaser, Johnson, Swank, Wagman, Holley, Gelfand, Logsdon, Fussler, and until recently, Downs, Orne, Stanford, McDiarmid, and Parker. Surely if academic library directors have the answer to what is needed in the education of academic librarians, they have been in the position to provide it and to help put it into effect. I agree with Dick Dougherty's editorial last November which asked whether library employers have a stake in quality education.² They certainly do. I know a number of instances — Michigan, UCLA, Illinois, Case Western, North Carolina, Missouri, Western Ontario, probably others — where the director of libraries holds an appointment in the library school; many of them attend faculty meetings, teach courses, interview prospective faculty members, and even go on retreats — not the kind you are probably thinking about.

I do not believe the examples I have used are unique and I do believe that there has been opportunity for input and that the input, perhaps subtle at times, has been lasting and significant. But to continue to maintain really strong programs, your continued support — your proselytizing, your moral and financial commitment — are needed more than ever.

Besides those directors or former directors who are now part-time or full-time faculty members, there are also a number of other academic librarians who teach part-time in library schools, and this has greatly strengthened and enriched our programs. Not only it is important for the curriculum, but the student/faculty/librarian interaction also allows practitioners to see what is going on in library schools. For example, schools like North Carolina, Simmons, Michigan, Illinois, and others, all have academic librarians listed as part-time faculty. We at Simmons draw heavily on the expertise of academic/research librarians in the community for course offerings, particularly in specialized subjects: Business Literature is taught by the Head Librarian of the Harvard Business School Library; Legal Bibliography is taught jointly by the Director and Associate Director of the Harvard Law School Library; Music Librarianship is taught jointly by the Director of the New England Conservatory of Music and Head of the Music Library at Harvard. I could list others and I am sure my colleagues from other institutions could cite just as many.

In addition, innumerable librarians participate as colloquia speakers, institute participants, or guest lecturers in courses. For instance, I teach a course in "Problems in Academic Libraries," and I have been fortunate enough to persuade Jay Luckner to participate for the last three years. Y. T. Feng and Keyes Metcalf have also participated in that class.

There has been, for a period of years, some discussion about an exchange program which might be worked out to give library educators and practicing librarians different exposures. Several years ago I wrote an editorial for College and Research Libraries on that very theme.³ The Chicago Public Library has recently announced a faculty-in-residence program of two or three months duration, for faculty members to update the knowledge and skills of library staffs and the residents themselves. Perhaps other such arrangements can be developed and perhaps the Council on Library Resources might explore the possibilities for academic/research libraries.

Finally, several academic/research librarians serve on advisory boards of library schools and at the same time several faculty members serve on advisory and planning committees of university/research libraries, either at their own institutions or at other institutions, and as consultants to other institutions. At least a couple of your colleagues today are deans of library schools and are now acting directors of university libraries.

As for other leadership characteristics of regular faculty members — not that this is by any means the most important indicator — have you looked at ALA lately? Five of the current 12 member Executive Board are educators and one-fourth of Council is made up of educators. Recent presidents include Jean Lowrie, Ed Holley, Tom Galvin, and now Betty Stone.

Another point that Dr. Conant brought up about research by faculty is an important one. I think it is being recognized more and more by faculties themselves, by the Committee on Accreditation, and by the profession. Some current and important research is emanating from library schools: the Pittsburgh collection use studies; Lancaster's evaluation studies at Illinois; Buckland's availability/use studies at Berkeley; Case Western's user satisfaction studies; Indiana's study on the publishing of scholarly journals; and Simmons' citizens'

information needs study are but examples of the kind of research that is being conducted now by faculty in library schools. Several schools including Indiana, Denver, Berkeley, and Simmons, have created Research Institutes within the school. Others, e.g. Pittsburgh, have several faculty members in "soft-money" positions doing basic research. These developments present golden opportunities to identify problems and to work with the field to solve them. Our Doctor of Arts program for library managers, with a field research component, is one example of the kind of faculty-directed research that is developing. Several Ph.D. programs and other "specialized" programs also offer this type of opportunity. Your input is needed and would be valued.

With these developments in mind, I would like to turn now to the subject of the curriculum. A 1976 Delphi study questioned librarians and information scientists, leaders within the profession and those whose opinions should be helpful, about the future of library/information science education.⁴ This study was aimed at the profession as a whole but can easily be focused on academic/research librarianship. When asked about content objectives for the first professional degree, over 75 percent of the respondents felt the following were both desirable and probable: 1) emphasis on theory, philosophy, and general principles applicable to all areas of librarianship in contrast to training in specific library practices; and 2) emphasis on educating librarians who have a sense of themselves as professionals, a broad understanding of the aims and goals of the profession as a whole, and a sense of the responsibility toward the public that being a professional implies.

Most respondents agreed on the desire for increased emphasis on human communication theories, processes and practices, on the social environment within which a library functions, on the needs and resources of the library's community, and more concentration on the library as a total information system. Related to this was the hope that there would be an emphasis on potential use of communication technology and its application to libraries. Items which did not appear highly probable or desirable were: student specialization by type of library, emphasis on type of library approach in library management courses, emphasis on foreign language skills, and lengthening the typical masters degree program.

It will be interesting to see how the results of your study compare with those comments of five years ago. In light of that study and in anticipation of your own study's results, as well as to address some of the generalizations in the Conant Report, I would like to briefly review for you some of the current curricula developments and talk about future trends.

The name change which has occurred with several library schools is only a formal acknowledgment of changes which have occurred in the educational programs. In 1970 only five schools had information science in their titles. Now 23, that is 38 percent of all the accredited schools, have Library and Information Science, Information Sciences, Information Studies, Information Management, etc. in their titles. This has meant a greater flexibility in most curricula, in the number of paths available, in the number of electives, and in the sequencing of courses. On one hand there has been a move toward what is called a Unified Core approach in some schools, where all "basic" elements are included in one required umbrella course. At the same time, other schools have decided to abandon the required course approach. All schools are constantly changing curricula: adding, reviewing, dropping, consolidating, dividing, and revising. One result of this activity has been

the development of both specialized courses and specialized programs. USC recently has gone through a major revision.

Of interest to academic/research librarians is the number and depth of specialization which is now possible. For instance:

- 18 schools, including eight which have joint degree programs with history departments, offer from four to eight courses in archives. One even offers a special degree in Archival Studies. In addition, ten more offer at least one course in archives.
- 26 schools have specializations in Health Sciences/Medical Librarianship. Another 15 offer one or two courses.
- 14 schools, including nine which offer joint degree programs with law schools, offer specializations in law librarianship. Another 19 offer one or two courses, while two schools have designated specialized degree programs for law librarianship.

Information science and technology has been integrated into the total curriculum of many schools rather than separating it out into special programs, although a couple of schools do offer separate degree programs in information science. Since there is no doubt that technology is one of the strongest factors in the future of academic/research libraries, as well as other types of libraries, most schools have introduced courses related to automated systems, information technology, networks, and media. And this has meant that faculty are being recruited with specialized knowledge in electronics, communications, computer design, operations research, media technology, etc. This has also meant that more schools are emphasizing technology with hands-on experience. On-line experience in schools is now commonplace and integrated into courses such as reference, cataloging, abstracting and indexing, and the literature courses, in addition to being offered in some special courses relating to on-line data base searching. Access to OCLC, RLIN, Lockheed, SDC, and BRS is not uncommon. Thirty-one schools offer specialization in information science, and another 15 offer from two to nine courses in that area.

The list goes on: Music Librarianship, Art Librarianship, Business Librarianship, Map Librarianship, etc. Granted, all specialized courses or programs must be approached with some degree of caution, lest we be accused of introducing "fad" courses into the curriculum. But the combination of special courses, independent study, and cross-listed courses from other disciplines can provide tailored programs for students in most library schools. Probably every school, in addition to offering a basic management course, also offers a type of library course and several offer courses in fiscal management, contemporary management theory, personnel management, public relations, and the like. Not every school can offer all of those specializations, nor should they. When I was preparing for this session, I wrote to a number of my colleagues and one responded by saying, "I believe that a major problem in the education of academic librarians for positions of leadership is in the time lag between the completion of the masters degree and the opportunity to step into such a position. Especially in times when the job market is tight, students feel compelled to think about the competition they will face in their first job, which in the academic library is not likely to be in the area of management." Your reaction

to how much — or how little — management is needed at the beginning level would be helpful.

Another trend, which I have mentioned before, is joint degree programs. Currently 37 percent of the accredited programs offer such possibilities, either with other departments in their own university or with other institutions. Several other schools are now developing such possibilities for new curricula and new career paths which are interdisciplinary. The most popular ones are in combination with art history, music history, education, communications, educational media, law, and business, where students receive both the MLS, or some variation thereof, and an MA, MS, MBA, or JD degree. In those cases, usually both programs are reduced by a number of hours so that the two programs can be completed in less time than two individual courses, with that subject degree being a career-oriented degree, along with the library degree. Other schools, like Western Michigan and Syracuse, have introduced a second degree; Columbia's Task Force on Education for Research Libraries Management has just completed its two-and-a-half-year study, and Simmons now has a Task Force on Alternative Programs. There are, of course, others, and there has been input from the profession in each case.

On the point of specialization, I fear that if all the skills and knowledge each of us separately, at one point or another, has considered essential were included in curricula, schools would be offering ten-year programs with several dozen specializations. This point brings up the desired length of the masters program. There has been some discussion among library educators and librarians about extending programs to more than the 36 or so hours which are currently required by most programs. A conference was held at Columbia University in March of this year on that very topic, and Dr. Churchwell delivered one of the invited papers.⁵

The rationale for extending the length of the masters degree program focuses on two factors: the expanded basic knowledge now required for librarianship, and the increasing pressure to achieve some competence in specialized areas while in library school.⁶ A few schools are now experimenting with two-year programs: UCLA, North Carolina, Washington, Chicago, and the Canadian schools that have had extended programs for several years. In most cases these are four semesters as opposed to the current programs, which are two semesters plus a summer session in most schools. The unresolved issue is the cost and worth of expanding the program. Are employers willing to pay more and is the first professional degree the proper time to specialize? One of my colleagues wrote, "If a university library director wants to see an expression of shock, let him or her tell the dean of the law school or the dean of the school of business administration what he or she is willing to pay the most able new library school graduate in his or her first job in the university library." Beginning salaries are only a little more than what one year of schooling costs these days and do not begin to compare with the salaries of graduates of some of the other professional programs.

One other component in this extended program is field work experience. The problem of implementing a high-quality formal practicum is the cost involved, not only for the school but for the host library as well. If it is to be carefully structured, with broad exposure to operations under a skilled supervisor, is it worth it to you? Besides, these extended programs are not the only opportunity for experience before graduation. Many other schools do offer opportunities for working in libraries or other information centers and some even require such a

course for individuals without prior experience. Many students are now working in libraries of the school's parent institution or in other libraries in the area. For example, MIT, Boston University, and Harvard all have internships of sorts for library science students. This means they pay tuition for those individuals until their degrees are completed. Michigan, Simmons, Wisconsin, Louisiana State, Illinois, North Carolina, and many others all offer assistantship programs in their institution's libraries. Sixty-five percent of our students at Simmons are working in libraries while in library school, and 80 percent have had experience before being admitted to library school. And, again, I do not think that Simmons is unique in that regard.

I believe that if students have not had worked in libraries before they graduate, it is their own choice, and prospective employers should be aware of this. We currently have over 140 paraprofessional and part-time professional positions going begging in the Boston area alone. On the point of experience, many special courses have field components, and this is in addition to the hands-on courses such as cataloging, on-line data bases, and the design and production of instructional materials. How many and how much are questions still to be resolved. The issue is a tightrope which must be walked. A balance of what is and what could be, the realities and the possibilities. It seems to me that the major responsibility for the subsequent practical application, implementation, and constant updating of knowledge, i.e. theory, that one acquires in library school rests with the individual graduate and, to an extent, with the library.

One other tentative movement which was initiated by ARL libraries is the development of internships, begun at the Library of Congress and the National Library of Medicine and then refined at Northwestern, and more recently at the University of New Mexico and Iowa State University. Those later examples are the outcome of the work a joint committee from that Deans/Personnel Officers meeting I mentioned before. Perhaps we should explore the possibility of more such "career half-way houses." The advantage of apprenticeship over internship has not been fully explored.

While I am on the general theme, I would like to say one fleeting word about continuing education. I strongly believe that continuing education is an important responsibility of many institutions, including library schools, first by inculcating it in the current students and then as an obligation to the profession. We have become all too painfully aware that our competencies may become dated with time, or perhaps inadequate to cope effectively with the demands of new clienteles and unconventional technologies. Someone has suggested that the times in which we live should be marked "Subject to change without notice." This is certainly true with librarianship. If one's experience is to be 40 years of constantly changing and more responsible activities, one cannot expect that one year of formal education in one's youth will be enough. Nor can one ignore the fact that many people have 40 years of experience while others may have one year of experience repeated 40 times. The advanced programs — second masters, sixth year, Doctor of Arts and Ph.D.s — are all based upon the premise that the librarian's professional education cannot be completely encompassed in that single year. My own personal feeling is that librarians should be encouraged to "specialize" only after they have been on the job for a couple of years and know what they want to do and what the prospects are for doing it. At that point, continuing education could be undertaken with clearer career goals in mind.

Library education does face many challenges, one of the most important being to broaden its horizons while at the same time offering more in-depth study of certain specializations. A generalist or a specialist program is a major issue in library education today. Another is that little serious thought has been given to a careful delineation of what is achieved as a result of practice and what from theory, what competencies librarians need to acquire and where they might be expected to acquire them, and how these can be best interconnected.

The library continues to be the students natural laboratory, and there must be the closest possible coordination between library education and library service. The challenges are clearly there. John Berry, in a recent editorial, wrote, "In the face of this change, and the rate of change, it is not realistic to expect any group of professionals to predict the future of libraries, not even the scholars and researchers in our library schools. It is reasonable, however, to expect them to extrapolate from current trends sufficiently to plot potential directions of development in information services and libraries to allow them to chart short-term scenarios and to recommend options to the profession."⁷ I hope and I believe that we are doing that.

Our academic arena offers the opportunity to students to reflect, to compare, to speculate, to get an overview of things, to see the whole scene, to develop the basis for further learning, to build patterns of inquiry and exploration, to gain different perspectives, to reflect upon practice. The happy mix between that experience and what a student will face on the job is the challenge. We must combine action with thought, speed with deliberation, and challenge with tradition. To proceed with one and ignore the other would be disastrous. There is still much to be done. I feel somewhat like a member of a flock of bantam chickens who has just been shown an ostrich egg by the local farmer, who said to them, I know you are doing the best you can, but I thought you should know what is going on elsewhere.

I hope we can continue to move together in the right direction.

References:

1. Cyril Houle, "The Role of Continuing Education in Professional Development," ALA Bulletin, v. 61, no. 3 (March 1967): 263.
2. "Library Education — Quo-Vadis?" Journal of Academic Librarianship, v. 5, no. 5 (November 1979): 251.
3. "Exchange Anyone," College and Research Libraries, v. 34, no. 5 (September 1973): 233-34.
4. Kenneth E. Vance, R. M. Magrill, T.W. Downen, "Future of Library Education: 1975 Delphi Study," Journal of Education for Librarianship, v. 18, no. 1 (Summer 1977): 3-17.
5. Richard L. Darling and Terry Belanger, eds., Extended Library Education Programs. New York: Columbia University, School of Library Service, 1980.
6. Kay Murray, "The Structure of MLS Programs in American Library Schools," Journal of Education for Librarianship, v. 18, no. 4 (Spring 1978): 279.
7. John Berry, "The Professors and the Future," Library Journal, v. 105, no. 15 (Sept. 1, 1980): 1679.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING:
A NEW CLR PROGRAM

Warren J. Haas

Council on Library Resources

MR. LUCKER: I have wondered a long time about how to introduce our third speaker. I have known Jim Haas for my entire professional career. He has, of course, long been associated with ARL as a director of ARL libraries, as a member of the Board of Directors from 1967 to 1971, as President of ARL from 1969 to 1970, and currently as President of the Council on Library Resources. I think it is fair to say we have no better friend in the whole field of support for academic and research libraries than Jim Haas.

MR. HAAS: First, I would like to say that I agree with everything that has been said so far. Second, I did not ask Jay Lucker how long I could talk, and I will not. And, third and most important, I regret that Dick De Gennaro is not here — he is driving across the country on his way to California — because this morning's paper carried the news that the man who chaired the search committee that selected both De Gennaro and Haas at the University of Pennsylvania was awarded the Nobel Prize.

Let me start with our hypotheses. The first is that research librarianship is a distinctive profession (or possibly an aggregation of professions) and thus deserves special and purposeful attention. The second is that research libraries, ten or 20 years from now, will be even more complicated organizations than they are today. The range of services they offer will be expanded, and the responsibilities of librarians in the processes of teaching and research will be even greater than they are now. If we accept this, the profession needs the best people possible; newcomers need to have exceptional educational opportunities and ways need to be found to add to their skills on a continuing basis as they go through their professional careers.

The Council on Library Resources has had, for its 24 years, a strong interest in the process of professional education, the quality of people in librarianship. Examples of CLR action in this area include intern programs and fellowships, grants to individuals to complete subject degrees, joint degree programs involving library and business education, and most recently, a grant to the C. W. Post Center at Long Island University to support ten or 12 faculty members from Post, St. John's University, and Queens College library schools seeking to upgrade their competence and understanding of information science by taking part in a special program created for that purpose.

When I came to the Council more than two years ago, I began to seek ways to continue the work Fred Cole had begun in this area of professional manpower and professional education. I met, I think it was in Dallas, with the committee that Bob Stueart mentioned, composed of personnel officers and library school deans. Over the last year or so we have had discussions with a number of individual deans and with a number of librarians. Within the Foundation Library Committee there have been discussions on the general subject of professional education and we have invited several library school deans and leaders in the profession to those meetings.

These meetings and discussions were synthesized as a working paper for the Board of the Council. At our May 1980 meeting, the decision was made that the Council should in fact try to expand its efforts in the field of professional education. My associates on the Board also warned me that my optimism was probably excessive and the new program would take a far longer time than I thought and much more money than I estimated.

Since that decision was taken, we have moved fairly rapidly. To begin with, we did not have any money for this purpose. But in the last three months, \$1.1 million has been committed by foundations to the Council. The Mellon Foundation very quickly after the Board's own meeting, funded us for at least a three-year period at the level of \$650,000 for those three years. And last week the Carnegie Corporation added \$450,000. So we are now at \$1.1 million for our professional education program. We think that about a million and three-quarters is required to do what we think we are going to try to do over the next three or possibly four years. And I think the signs are good that the total amount will become available.

Once funded, we had to find a name for the organization. We have settled on Professional Education and Training for Research Librarianship. It is always a hard time to find a name to match the acronym you have chosen ahead of time.

(Laughter.)

Our acronym is PETREL and I will get to that choice in a minute. The petrel is a bird, as you ornithologists know. And the second definition for one of the species of the storm petrel is: a person who brings discord or appears at the onset of trouble, a rebel.

(Laughter.)

But the real reason for choosing PETREL is that John McDonald (our resident ornithologist) agreed to chair the —

(Laughter.)

— Advisory Committee that is a central part of this whole enterprise. It is rumored that he has applied for a Connecticut license plate that will carry the message. And what could augur better for the cause?

The first thing we did, actually even before we had any money, was to establish an Advisory Committee that includes at the moment Robert Vosper; John McDonald as Chairman; Margot McBurney, who chairs ARL's Task Force on Library Education; Rutherford Rogers of Yale, who has thought long and hard on this subject and who actually prepared a paper on the subject of professional education that he asked me to read a year or so ago; Russell Bidlack, who is Dean of the Library School at the University of Michigan; and William Gerberding, who is President of the University of Washington in Seattle. I think we will probably add one more academic officer from a university, an individual with a real interest in the subject of professional education and research libraries.

That Advisory Committee has begun its work. We just had a two-day meeting in Washington and our next two-day meeting is scheduled for Los Angeles in

mid-November. One thing that suggests that we are on the right track (or that we might find the right track) is the fact that when an announcement was made of this new enterprise in a press release and in a letter sent to the deans of all the schools that grant doctoral degrees in this country and in Canada, we received very enthusiastic letters of response and encouragement. Several of those schools are actually now actively at work with us in trying to help plot our course. I have had the same kind of response from a number of people in this room. And my instincts tell me the time is right to take some new action in this area.

I mentioned the names of the Advisory Committee. Obviously a great many others will be involved. We anticipate setting up task forces to address specific topics and will try and tap the best people we can in the country, at ARL, and in library schools. And also, I would say, individuals from other disciplines as well, because I think we need advice and counsel from the widest possible range of people. We are also interested in making sure that we develop some international links in this, because research librarianship transcends political borders.

I want to underscore from the beginning that we are embarking on this enterprise absolutely certain that we do not have any answers. But we are committed to try to find them. And when I talk about the activities that we see as possibilities, it is with that caveat in mind. Everything is being thought through. I suspect we will make some false starts, we will do things that produce nothing in the way of useful results, but as time goes on, I think we will identify areas where we can be of assistance.

Let me quickly run down our list of prospects. First, we want to explore the possibility of working with a very few first-rate library schools in an effort to develop professional degree programs specifically geared to research librarianship.

Second, we are pretty much convinced in Committee discussions to this point that a new emphasis on an internship as an integral part of the professional education program is probably critically important, and it is possible that this internship might be used to give each student a chance to test a specialization in the field, rather than simply as a superficial introduction to librarianship generally.

Third, we are convinced that we need to recruit more exceptional individuals to research librarianship. This is a tremendously difficult thing to do, and I do not have the vaguest idea how to go about it. About 95 professions or fields of specialization are identified in Graduate Record Exam (GRE) reports, including librarianship. Last year, of those who took the GRE, potential librarians as a whole did very well in the verbal part of the GRE, scoring in the upper quartile. But in the analytical side of the three components of the tests, potential librarians were well below the 50th percentile. In mathematics, especially, librarians were pretty close to the bottom of the list; maybe three-quarters of the subject fields represented in the set of people taking the GRE were above librarians in the mathematics test. I believe, and others concur, that there are real requirements for more people with analytical and mathematical skills in research libraries. We need to find a way to expand the range of skills in individuals coming into the profession. I would simply say we need a fair share of the people graduating from the best liberal arts colleges, whether their majors are in the humanities or the social sciences or the sciences, in research librarianship.

By the way, I would point out that those scores that I talked about in GREs for librarians are about identical to those of lawyers. I have no conclusions on that one either.

In addition to paying specific attention to basic professional education, there are a number of other activities that, we think, need some help and thought. There is a strong prospect — and I will talk a little more about this later — that we will develop a senior fellows program to assist individuals recently named to major policy posts in libraries. We want to provide an opportunity for them to work together, with some exceptional guidance, for brief periods of time, and to pay special attention to the distinguished people now in the profession. This would be a substantial addition to our present management intern program.

Another diversion. Last year we had 100 or so applications to our intern program, largely because of the enthusiastic support from people in this room. And I am happy to say that the last few days of mail have brought in more than 60 applications for next year, which is a superb response.

Back to PETREL. We also intend to support and work with a number of people to develop a series of conferences designed to consider the "frontiers" of research librarianship. If the profession itself is in a state of transition and research libraries are in the process of making change, not enough attention is being given to the fundamental questions that underlie what is coming down the pike in terms of research library operations and the relationships of those libraries to scholarship and all of the other activities related to scholarly communication. We also intend to find ways to support first-rate people doing research and analytical work, in library schools and other parts of universities and in libraries, on a large number of topics, possibly those developed out of the frontier conferences.

And, finally, although we have not talked about it yet, I think we are going to have to give some consideration to finding ways to bring people who hold doctorates in a subject field into the profession of research librarianship. Discussion of this topic is, again, far too premature, but I keep trying to describe, for my own sake, the composition of the research library staff in the year 2000. First, I would estimate for every 100 professionals, maybe 65 or 70 should have substantial and active skill and interest in a subject field, simply because to be a part of a university (and that is what librarians have to be — they have to be a part of the central activities of universities) they must bring this subject ability with them. Second, I think ten or 15 of each 100 should be specifically trained in computer and communications technology, simply because this is an integral part of the change facing these libraries. And finally, a small portion, perhaps ten professionals, must be specifically trained in the skills of management. Management requires more than instinct. It is an ability that requires special skills that are only acquired through training.

In a sense, this is the kind of library staff that might meet needs during the years ahead. All would have basic education in research librarianship, a full comprehension of what the profession is. Not everybody needs to be a manager, but everyone needs to comprehend what good management is. It is the quality of individuals in this aggregation of "professions" working together that is the key probably to running our research libraries, not only now, but certainly in the years ahead.

What I want to turn to specifically — and I did not look at my time when I started so I am safe — is to very quickly point out a few things for ARL's consideration, both ARL as an organization and ARL as the set of library directors that should be concerned.

First, if the result of this effort is to increase the number of exceptionally well educated individuals who are themselves selectively chosen for the program, libraries will have to provide them with assignments that are a challenge. These individuals will have to have an opportunity to move ahead quickly, at an appropriate speed, and they will have to be paid salaries that attract them to the profession in the first place and that keep them in the profession in the second place.

Second, universities will have to be made to understand that the transformation of libraries that is under way will require exceptional staff.

Third, some libraries, many represented in this room, will have to work with library schools to help develop and operate intern programs as an integral part of (and not an appendix to) basic educational programs. These internships, as I said, will probably offer an opportunity to develop specialized skills in specific subjects or in administration. The Advisory Committee plans to set up a task force on the matter of internships, and we will request ARL participation in that enterprise.

If our ideas or thoughts about a special fellows program for newly named senior policy officers are valid, they will require a commitment of perhaps four to six weeks of intensive work, possibly during a summer, and perhaps once or twice during the year for a week. Will universities be able to free those individuals selected for that program?

Another point. We would like to suggest right now that ARL name a special committee to consider ways it, as an organization and you as individuals, can participate in recruiting exceptional people into the library profession.

Finally, I would suggest that when ARL meets that they invite to their meetings those members of library school faculties in the area who are, themselves, specifically concerned with research librarianship and the functions of research libraries in their own research and teaching. This is just one small way for ARL to begin to open more effective communication with the schools themselves.

I will end by underscoring one point. I want to make it clear that we are not out to transform professional education. We are simply seeking ways to refine a specific segment of that education. I would underscore that we are at the beginning. The number of questions far exceeds the number of answers. But we are, I think, all convinced that maybe the time is ripe. We have some people committed to helping and we have the money that seems required to make a start. It is time to go to work.

DISCUSSION

MR. LUCKER: First, let me ask if any of the speakers would like to make comments before we open the floor for discussion? Otherwise, I will ask members of the audience for questions or comments.

MR. VEANER (University of California, Santa Barbara): I simply wish to echo very strongly the remarks that have been made about integrating internships into the administrative structure of the library. Right now, although all of us would be supportive of a concept of the intern, it is a terrible drain on our budgets and on our personnel economy. When one writes a proposal in the normal sense, one always throws in an overhead factor. We need integration to provide for this overhead factor. I think the comparison with medical schools is not quite valid because the overhead factor is built into the social and economic structure of the hospital economy. We have to build that overhead factor into the library economy.

MR. FORTH (Pennsylvania State University): My concern in all these discussions of library education and everything else goes back to a more fundamental problem in higher education generally and that is: as higher education is being democratized and degraded, the quality of our undergraduate students is shockingly bad. They cannot read, they cannot write, they are inarticulate. They go to library schools, they emerge not much better than when they went in, and then they come to us — and I am in a position where I get pretty good candidates. I am almost embarrassed to have some of these young people. They are very bright, they are able to do their work, they catch on, we plug them into all kinds of new things, they take these responsibilities very well indeed. But in terms of having any of the urbane, intellectual qualities that I feel are an important part of university life, they simply do not have it. They work hard. They are veritable ergophiles, and yet I am embarrassed to have them meet with the Senate Library Committee for fear of their gaucheries and the kind of things that they come up with. This disturbs me and I am particularly interested in the fact that of our speakers today only Mr. Haas, with due respect to you other gentlemen, mentioned the possibility of actively recruiting holders of Ph.D.s from other disciplines.

There are many of the more civilized disciplines right now that are under considerable stress and we can reach these people, we can bring them in, providing we can cope with university recruitment and affirmative action machinery. And I would suggest that, if we look into this, it damn well ought not to be the failures in those disciplines that we recruit. We do not need those. Let's get those who are succeeding. I hope the library schools will look to this.

MR. STUEART: I indicated the number of students that are entering librarianship with a second masters degree, but I did not mention Ph.D.s — that was a part of my talk that I had cut out because of time. We do have a number of Ph.D.s who are entering the profession now. Whether you feel that it is desirable, I do not know.

MR. FORTH: I do.

MR. STUEART: I think that many of them do have the commitment to the profession. At Simmons this semester we have 14 Ph.D.s in the masters program.

We also have a number of J.D.s, people who are specifically interested in going into law librarianship. I think this is a trend, people entering librarianship with subject backgrounds who want to go primarily into academic libraries, and I do not not believe that they are failures from other professions that are looking to librarianship as an easy way out.

MR. FORTH: Don't mistake me. I am not saying that we should recruit them.

MR. STUEART: No, but I think that this is happening.

MR. FORTH: Yes. One of my biggest problems in this whole practice has been that my own librarians needed considerable education to accept the fact that if we recruit someone with a Ph.D. in a subject field, that person deserves and would indeed get more money. This has caused a certain amount of anguish over the years, but I think it is beginning to calm down.

MR. WEDGEWORTH (American Library Association): My comments are to the core of the program, as I heard this morning.

First of all, I would like to commend ARL for bringing together what I think are impressive resources to focus on the aspect of library education that is most important to you as an organization and to you as individual directors of research libraries. I think we are beyond the point where we can look at library education in general, and expect a general program to serve everybody's needs. We have seen in the past one other example of an effort where our school media specialists, as we now call them, did get together — with outside resources and the library schools — to transform what we knew in the old days as school librarians into professionals who can now take their place among those educators in the institutions in which they find themselves. Therefore, I think that what ARL does is going to be very important for the entire field.

The second comment that I would like to make is to reinforce the bringing in of outside resources. I have been fortunate enough to have had the opportunity to observe the library profession in other countries and one of the things that I have noticed, particularly in the Soviet Union and Germany, is that they do rely on bringing in expertise from other fields. But they do one other thing that we must keep in mind. They require what I would call an acculturation period for those experts so that they truly become a part of the institution in which they are going to work, rather than simply appendages from another sphere of academic activity who happen to be residing in the library. It is a very great challenge for us to impress upon these outside experts that this institution that is so much a part of the academic atmosphere has a life of its own and must incorporate those skills and knowledge from other academic areas in ways that enhance the library as a whole.

Finally, I want to thank Ralph Conant because he did stimulate substantial discussion about library education and I think we are much too mature not to be able to absorb that and go on to even more successful futures.

MR. BUNGE (University of Wisconsin): I am currently President of the Association of American Library Schools (AALS) and I concluded that unless I said something today, the Executive Secretary of that body would not approve my expense voucher. I also wanted to thank you for inviting the Association of

American Library Schools to be represented here and to learn as much as I have. My charge now, of course, is to take it back to the Association.

I would like to invite the ARL and the Council on Library Resources to stay in close liaison with the Association of American Library Schools. AALS, particularly with the demise of Library Education Division of the American Library Association, is feeling a great responsibility for representing the library education community to library practitioners, and we hope that you will continue in close liaison with us.

In evidence of that, the Association of American Library Schools has launched what we hope will be an aggressive legislative program. We are convinced that the quality library education programs in this country are in grave danger of doing what my chancellor at Madison calls sliding into mediocrity under the pressures of financial starvation that seem endemic on campuses in this country and in Canada, especially in states whose economies are particularly affected by the present conditions. So, we are launching a legislative program to try to work in all ways we can through Title II-B of the Higher Education Act, through the Library Services and Construction Act, through the emerging Library and Information Service Act, and through, perhaps, initiating some legislative things on our own to try to guarantee an enhanced, quality library education. Warren Haas outlined a tremendous opportunity for us to work toward that goal.

We also are very interested in field practice. Our annual conference, just prior to 1981 ALA Midwinter, is going to be on the topic of field practice. Library educators and librarians will come together and talk about how we might develop programs for the future for our field practice, including internships.

We also are trying to set up joint liaison with various professional associations and organizations related to librarianship and information services. We had a first meeting of such a joint group, with representatives of the American Society for Information Science, the Special Libraries Association, the Medical Library Association, and ARL at the summer conference of ALA, where we considered how educators and practitioners can work together. We are going to have a follow-up, invitational meeting at ALA Midwinter on February 2, 1981, and again invite representatives from those associations to get together. I rather suspect that Margot McBurney will be reporting further to us on your study and what it means.

So, I want to extend to you greetings from AALS, ask you please to stay in close liaison, and to tell you how pleased I am for another example of what I think is absolutely essential in library education: the close and continuing cooperation between the educators on the one hand, and the practicing field on the other hand.

M3: SESSIONS (McGill University): I am the Director of the Library School at McGill University. I am also the chair of the Canadian Council on Library Schools but, since that has no budget, I have to justify my existence for everything here to McGill University. I must say the Dean of the Graduate School, to whom I report and with whom I discussed this meeting just two days ago, was extremely interested in the meeting and the fact that I was coming.

One thing that struck me immediately — and it was reinforced by every talk that went on — was that the concerns of this organization, the concerns for improving the quality of research librarianship, are identical with the concerns for

improving and maintaining the quality of librarianship in all areas. This is extremely important to us. At McGill, about 60 percent of our students go into special libraries and I believe that this is true of some other large library schools in large metropolitan areas. Then perhaps 20 percent go into academic libraries. So, while I thought, what was going to be said here might only be of interest to 20 percent, actually it is of interest to at least 80 percent, if not more.

I am extremely interested in developing the internships, especially if they can be incorporated as integral parts of the library. I do not think it is going to work very well if we just try to graft interns onto existing library structures. Academic libraries are going to have to become like hospitals where the interns, the residents, etc., are integral parts of the institution. That is what I would very much like to see happen. Then we would have a model that we could perhaps use in some of other kinds of libraries.

MR. VOSPER (University of California, Los Angeles): I am Bob Vosper, of UCLA Library School, formerly the University Librarian. I want to say thanks to ARL for letting an oldtimer come back briefly. This suggests one point I want not to bring up afresh but to reiterate. It is a great pleasure to come back because one of the real problems that has been mentioned more than once — one I think we really have to grapple with — is a closer interaction between the teaching side and the practitioner side.

Jim Haas has suggested opportunities to bring teachers of research librarianship into the ARL meetings. I think that is crucial and that they are eager to come. It is one thing to sit at home and read the *Journal of Academic Libraries*, etc., and it is another thing to be mixed into the real discussion and problems that you people are concerned with, because that is what we need to bring to the attention of students. I have been six years out of ARL in the rough and tumble of administration, and I feel out of touch. We get bright, young Ph.D.s beginning to teach whose library activity is minimal, and they are anxious to get some real interaction. This might involve the possibility of tying sabbatical opportunities to research opportunities in a library setting. There would have to be a mutual intellectual understanding but it could be fruitful on both sides.

Secondly, let me just reiterate what Bob Stueart and others have said. This is a real time of change in library education. It is not casual, it is real ferment, and this is the time to move forward effectively. The parts of change have been mentioned, for example, the movement toward a longer degree program and the move toward the internship which has been underscored — and I would agree with my colleague from McGill this must be a formal, monitored, evaluated internship where the host institution takes on an obligation and is evaluated along with the student. Now, I hear that this is costly, but it is important for the profession and it has advantages at both ends. It is costly for the schools too, so do not think the cost is just at the recipient end.

These are the main points I would like to underline, with the addition of two serious problems we face. The first is the long tradition in the profession of concentrating on the day-one-hiring-in skills, which we are not interested in — we are interested in the long-term intellectual impact and growth. And then, second, as has been suggested, what happens to those bright, skilled, promising people when they get out of library school? Will you give them a better job and better promise? That is crucial.

MR. McDONALD (University of Connecticut): In embarking on the PETREL Project, as Chair of the Advisory Committee, I certainly recognized my own shortcomings, and I have found this morning's program very helpful. I feel that Bob Stueart did an admirable job of telling us what is going on and what is good about library education. I feel that Ralph Conant has done us a service. I have read a good deal of the criticism of The Conant Report which, it has seemed to me, has focused mainly on methodology. But a lot of us hear in Conant's recommendations things that we ourselves have observed and believed. I think that this is a more constructive report than we might have been led to believe.

There is one aspect of the subject that was only glancingly alluded to this morning and I would like to raise the question. I am concerned with what I might call the other side of the coin. The project that Jim Haas has outlined deals with how we recruit, train, and upgrade opportunities for practicing professionals. My concern is with a program which might seek to improve the level of instruction in our library schools. Just as librarians need continuing education, so do library school faculties. I think Bob Stueart alluded to this. But I am wondering if we might hear a little bit about what the library schools are doing to give their own faculty members new opportunities for improving their knowledge of the profession and their skills.

I might say that in our discussions so far in the Advisory Committee we have wondered whether research libraries might provide opportunities for library school faculty members on sabbatical leave to conduct research projects on the premises. This would have the effect of producing useful results, perhaps on a specific project of value to the host library and, at the same time, providing the library school faculty member with an opportunity to see at close hand the workings of a major research library.

Is anybody here willing to respond?

MR. STUEART: I will be glad to respond, John. I could not agree with you more. That is the reason that I said in my talk that I was very excited to see what was happening with the Chicago Public Library where they have a library faculty member in residence who is there not only to talk with the professionals, the practicing librarians, but also to learn about what is going on in large public libraries.

I think that is a very positive step and I would hope that similar opportunities would be developed. I mentioned that back in the early '70s when Dick Dougherty was still editor of College and Research Libraries, I wrote an editorial on that very thing called "Exchange Anyone?" with the idea that perhaps there would be opportunities for library educators and academic research librarians and other types of librarians to do some sort of exchange. Of course, the mechanics of that sort of thing seem to get in the way. I presented the idea to Beta Phi Mu at one point to see if maybe they would be interested in funding it and at that point they felt that their funds were limited and they could not. But the Chicago Public Library step is a very important one and library educators would welcome the opportunity either on a sabbatical or simply a leave of absence, something that we certainly should explore.

MR. BUNGE: One other point to be mentioned, I think, is consultancies. We find in our library school faculty that consultancies, and serving on task forces that

are set up by the university library and the university system to study library problems, are a very good way for our faculty members to become more aware on a day-to-day detailed basis of what is going on in the library in their area of specialization. They also contribute to the work of that task force or to the solution of problems of those libraries from an objective, outside, and, we hope, scholarly and information-based perspective. Consultancies and services on task forces and committees related to libraries are very good ways for this kind of update which does not disrupt the life, family, and economy as much as leaves of absence sometimes do.

MR. GHERMAN (Iowa State University): I was a member of that earlier group of ACRL personnel officers that first started to talk about internships. We felt the recruitment process is not necessarily a precise one and in the paper shuffling we are not necessarily identifying the best new graduates and getting them into the appropriate job which is going to make them the most productive librarian in their career. The feeling was that academic libraries should adopt a process similar to that of the Library of Congress where they, in essence, skim the cream off from the library schools and then get them into the right job.

We have tried it once at Iowa State. I do not think we found that the cost of bringing in an intern was a great burden on the library. As a matter of fact, I think the intern probably gave us a lot more than we ever felt we expended in cost. A second benefit was that our first intern went on to Harvard, and, I believe, is doing a very good job for them. If we continue this process, all ARL libraries will start to benefit as interns move from library to library.

LIBRARY EDUCATION:
THE DIRECTOR'S POINT OF VIEW

Margot B. McBurney

Queen's University

MR. LUCKER: Margot McBurney is the Librarian at Queens University in Canada. She is a member of the ARL Board and is chair of the ARL Task Force on Library Education. She is going to report on the work of the Task Force.

MS. McBURNEY: In its charge to the Task Force on Library Education, the ARL Board of Directors asked the Task Force to do three things: 1) to gather the opinions of directors; 2) to provide a forum for discussion of these opinions at this meeting; and 3) to present a report at the February 1981 Board Meeting summarizing our findings and recommending action to be taken by the Association.

The questionnaire was to be a preliminary effort to respond to the Board's first charge to the Task Force and a way to stimulate our thinking about library education, and to provide framework for discussion at this meeting. There were some obvious problems with the questionnaire, which several respondents drew to the attention of the Task Force, but it is important that we focus on the issues and the opinion trends that have been identified in the short time we have this morning. Seventy-six questionnaires out of the 111 sent out were completed and returned. Several who found the questionnaire inadequate to express their views replied with thoughtful, constructive comments. I hope many of you who have not yet commented will express your opinions and provide direction to the Task Force.

In the next few minutes I will try to summarize the survey results, and then provide a brief opportunity for discussion. If there is time, I would like to conclude by asking you to respond to some of the specific issues raised by the responses to the survey.

To begin, we developed a list of 19 skills that formed the basis of the questionnaire. The first seven skills listed include some of the newer or more nontraditional skills which have become significant in libraries, often considered the tools of the library specialist:

- research skills
- knowledge of a foreign language
- in-depth knowledge of an academic subject
- statistical skills
- system analysis skills
- computer programming skills
- on-line retrieval skills

The next eight skills are the substance of the basic, traditional library school curriculum:

- knowledge of general bibliography
- knowledge of general reference materials

knowledge of specialized reference materials
knowledge of theories of organizing information
basic knowledge of library automation
knowledge of collection development theories and practices
knowledge of library history
knowledge of library issues

The last four skills are what I consider to be "people" skills or, in the broadest sense, the managerial skills:

human relations skills
supervisory skills
managerial skills
analytical skills

Question one asked what skills are needed now by entry-level librarians. The first seven nontraditional skills were found to be basically highly desirable, except that an equal number of directors considered systems analysis and programming skills as specialist skills or not important at the entry level. Statistical skills were seen to be highly desirable by more than half of the respondents, as well as not as important at the entry level by one third of the respondents. I wonder if this had something to do with a significant difference in needs between the larger research libraries and the smaller research libraries.

The traditional skills were seen to be either required (general bibliography and general reference) or highly desirable, except that there was no real agreement about knowledge of library history or library issues; the responses ranged from required to not needed, almost equally divided, except that no one thought these were important for the specialist. The managerial skills were seen to be either required (human relations and analytical skills) or highly desirable (supervisory and managerial skills.) One-third to one-half of the responses indicated that supervisory skills and managerial skills are not needed by entry-level librarians. Several of the skills that were identified with a specialist include an in-depth knowledge of an academic subject, systems analysis skills, and programming skills.

Question two asked which skills would be needed by the entry-level librarian hired five years from now. I expected to see a shift in responses that would indicate some trends in educational requirements. Surprisingly, to me and to the Task Force, there was little change indicated except for a few areas — in-depth subject knowledge, basic knowledge of library automation, and human relations — which show a slight shift from highly desirable to required.

Question three attempted to identify skills which should be taught in library schools to entry-level librarians for a variety of positions. We wanted to see if the skills were position-specific. There were few surprises in either looking at the skills across the jobs or at the jobs which require the skills, and the question proved to be the least useful to the Task Force in identifying issues.

Question four asked how often directors find that, after initial training, entry-level librarians possess these 19 skills to a satisfactory degree. Responses indicate quite clearly that directors are most satisfied with general bibliography and general reference material skills and least satisfied with statistical skills, systems

analysis skills, and computer programming skills. It is much more difficult to differentiate between levels of satisfaction with the rest of the skills, and because of time constraints I will not attempt to do so.

Collection development seems to be in a class of its own with responses indicating wide variation in the levels of preparation in this area for entry level librarians; however nearly half the responses were in the "few possess these skills" category.

Questions five and six dealt with where skills are acquired and where directors think they should be acquired. Most skills are acquired in library schools or on the job, with some use of institutes and conferences for human relations, supervisory, managerial, and analytical skills. More than half of the respondents believed the these "people" skills should be taught in library schools, and only a few thought the skills are being acquired there. A shift from on-the-job training to library schools is indicated as desirable for a majority of the skills. In other words, directors would like to do less of the work while library schools do more. The results appear to indicate that directors would like the library schools to strengthen their students' skills in research, use of statistics, systems analysis, on-line retrieval, human relations, supervision, management, and analysis. A large number of directors believed that knowledge of a foreign language and of an academic subject should be acquired in another academic program before hiring. This may have implications for library school admissions requirements.

Question seven addressed current methods of staff development and indicated the strongest support for tuition exemption and time off for classes for all but the human relations, supervisory, and managerial skills. These last skills are taught in internal and external workshops and at meetings to which staff must travel. Very few directors indicate that internships are a method used for staff development.

Question eight asked are individuals without the degree hired for professional positions. Fifteen respondents answered "yes," 47, "rarely" and 15, "never." The positions most often cited where people were hired without the M.L.S. degree were archivist/manuscript curator, rare book curator, special collections, systems analyst, business officer, subject bibliographer, programmer, computer specialist, and personnel officer.

Question nine focused on internships. Of 36 directors who have had experience with internships, 31 thought them very valuable and said they were worthwhile. Only 14 respondents have an internship in their budget, 37 would be willing to add an internship position but 27 could do so only if external funding were available.

The task force has not been able to attempt a detailed analysis of the results, nor have we been able to follow up with those who did not respond to the questionnaire. I would be interested in having your comments as to what the next step should be for the task force.

Several of you who commented — and I must say that many of you completed the questionnaire and included a lot of very valuable comments — pointed out that library entrance requirements must be higher than they are, that we should stress education rather than skills. Some indicated that our greatest need was for middle managers and that the greatest concern was not for entry-level librarians.

One question which continues to nag is whether the size of the research library is significant in what is required of entry level librarians and I tend to think that there is a great difference. However, we have no results that indicates this specifically. We had hoped to be able to divide the answers to the questionnaires into groups by library size, but there simply was not time to do that.

Another question that was raised this morning and in many of your responses was whether we are paying appropriate salaries to get the high level of education and skills that we appear to want.

The purpose of this has been to stimulate your thinking and to hear your responses at this meeting. I will not take any more time and will be glad to hear comments from each and every one of you.

DISCUSSION

MS. BATTIN (Columbia University): As the task force knows, I was one of those that found myself unable to answer the questionnaire and I would like to explain why. I believe that a basic flaw in our inquiry was that we are talking about professional education for beginning level positions and as I look at other professions such as medical, legal, business — scholarly professions — it is assumed that people who are accepted into those programs will proceed through their career and be educated for distinctive performance and leadership in that profession. The educational program is designed to give them the intellectual tools to do just that. Bob Vosper mentioned this in passing this morning and I agree that it is something we need to think more seriously about in designing our educational programs. When I interview young graduates from library schools, I am not interested in finding out what skills they possess. I leave that up to the individual manager of the unit in which they will work. I ask them what are their career goals and in what are they interested — what drew them to librarianship and what they see as the contribution that they can make. I must say I get very depressing responses. Many of them have not even thought about that. It seems to me that much of the educational program is designed simply for entry level. My acquaintanceship with young professionals in the legal, medical, and business professions indicates that their educational program forces them to specialize early, forces them to explore the field, to understand the shape of the total career, and then to build an educational program which will support their goal. Perhaps one of the ways that we in the libraries can cooperate with the library schools is a much closer relationship in building both an alumni network and a practitioner network, if you will, in helping very early to indicate to young people the demands of the profession.

Another aspect that I think is lacking is intellectual rigor. If we look at educational programs, again for doctors, lawyers, merchant chiefs, and also those who enter the scholarly professions, it seems to me that we can identify a distinctive kind of training of the mind that is closely associated with each profession. That is what we need to develop for librarianship: a distinctive, intellectual hallmark of the profession in which we all share a common intellectual training to the approach of the problems.

MR. PINGS (Wayne State University): Some years ago, I had a grant from the Public Health Service to conduct an internship program. Seven people went through this program. In a large institution an internship means rotation. It does not mean having a job in which you are going to teach someone, somehow, some extra skills. The best internship is to go to a library where there is only one or two librarians. You are going to learn everything, though maybe not in-depth. But my observation of internships of those seven people was that we spent a substantial amount of time and had the money to do it, but I do not see that of those people who were successful — I am talking of ten years later — the internship really helped them very much. The ones who were successful were bright and they would have been able to ask the questions and learn without this very expensive program. The key is selecting the individual who has the curiosity and, as Pat Battin said, who has the commitment. They are going to learn no matter what you do.

MS. MARTIN (Johns Hopkins University): First of all, I would like to say that while I do not agree with what Vern said in substance, I do agree that there needs to be a refinement or an understanding of the definition of the words that we use such as internship. I have been confused this morning and I think that would be helpful.

My principal problem is with specialization, and perhaps I am being shortsighted. We are a rather small profession, of course, scattered throughout the continent and there are not that many professional positions available when you compare librarianship to some of the other professions that we have mentioned. I do not know whether this is going to change in the future.

In our libraries right now, as we recruit for professional positions, we have search committees. The search committees look at so-called appropriate background and appropriate experience. I have found that in recent years there has been a tendency to make it less easy for somebody to shift from one specialization to another, either to another type of library or to a new area within a library, such as technical services to public services. It is purely a question of whether specialization is in fact appropriate. It may very well be. In fact, I have no disagreement with anything or with most of what has been said this morning. It is just an uneasiness that I wanted to voice.

MR. WEDGEWORTH: I wanted to ask if your Committee received any comments from the ARL Directors regarding the students who are already on campus. It may be naive on my part, but I always wonder why research libraries have never exploited the assistantship process more than they have. Certainly there are employees in cataloging departments and there are students in library schools who work in libraries but not an organized program that might address some of the aspects of the problem being raised by assistantship. Did you receive any comments on that?

MS. McBURNEY: No, we did not. In my own institution I find on a regular basis many of the library technicians find their jobs interesting and challenging enough that they decide to go to library school, some of them after 10 or 12 years of experience in supervisory positions.

MR. FRANTZ (University of Virginia): I may not be saying anything that you are not all familiar with but we do have a fine Office of Career Planning at the University of Virginia. I am listed in that office as a person that students may see about careers in librarianship. We all know what is happening in fields such as English, history, and philosophy. It is very difficult for very gifted people to know sometimes whether they want to pursue these fields and possibly be out of a job. I am getting more and more serious inquiries, students coming to me far along in their careers, wondering about librarianship. I see at least four very fine candidates a year, and many of them enter library schools. They know nothing about this profession and are excited about what they hear. They have talked to different members on our staff, people who are stars, who have been out of library school maybe five years, and it has had a very beneficial effect of recruiting some of the best people to our profession. It works through this very well funded organization at our university. It has been very helpful to us. I wonder if all of us have that same opportunity at our universities.

MS. McBURNEY: Perhaps I could just take the opportunity to ask the rest of you to raise your hands if you have had a similar experience on your own campuses. (Show of a few hands.) A few have.

MR. FORTH: It also has the benefit that if they do come to see you, you can take this dude who lives at home with momma and is good to her and loves books and you can discourage him from going to library school. I am very firm on that.

MR. BUNGE: Charles Bunge again, the token educator. I am fascinated, Margot, by the results of your questionnaire. In scanning it, I was reminded of something that the ARL librarians need to remember. You experience at the most excruciating level what is perhaps the fundamental dilemma in library education. We practice a profession that has a core of knowledge — basic bibliography, the knowledge about knowledge and its transmission and how it is used in society — and yet that profession is practiced in an organization that has to be run and administered by the same people. This is an excruciating dilemma for the ARL library which is so complex to administer. I think one can get by, perhaps, a little better in the smaller context, so that the library schools and the profession are both facing this terrible dilemma.

My understanding is that in the medical and legal professions, where there is a high degree of intellectual rigor around a carefully defined body of professional knowledge, they do not have to worry as much about the administration of large operations. There is a separate curriculum for hospital administrators. Lawyers learn about running large law firms after they graduate by attending continuing education institutes on running law firms. Yet library schools and we librarians are faced with this job of trying to do both at a high level of skill in what Mr. Conant very rightly calls the "crash course" approach.

MS. MCBURNEY: Can I ask you to take that one step further and make some recommendations as to how we deal with it?

MR. BUNGE. I wish I could, I really do. Wrestling with this dilemma is one of the things that takes a great deal of faculty time in planning curricula. Every time someone thumps the table and says we are slighting basic professional knowledge and adding all this extra stuff of statistics, administration, etc., somebody else thumps the table equally as hard and says we simply cannot turn out people who do not have these skills. And table thumping is, I suppose, one approach to curriculum design but, I have a suspicion, not the best.

MR. STUEART: I would like to follow up on that comment and tie it with a question that Pat Battin asked about whether we are actually preparing individuals for the first job out of library school, if we are focusing them beyond that first job, or if we are asking them to look at their own career goals. I think that many of the library schools are not really preparing for the first job. At least, I hope that we are not setting their sights on the first job; I hope that we are setting their sights beyond that. We have a problem, though, if we are because I have heard many people in the profession say that we hire a new person who wants to come in and run the library tomorrow. Is that the kind of aggressive person we really want in the organization? It is a dilemma for us. It is a dilemma for the students and I know it is for you.

MS. BATTIN: I think the question that Charles Bunge raised is a very important one and it relates to the organization of libraries and how we integrate and use most effectively the staff that we need. We are a little bit different than the legal profession and the medical profession in that we are always, I believe, working in an organization, usually in a large organization. We do not practice on our own the way doctors and lawyers do. So in a sense we must move away from this concept of the autonomous professional which has given those of us in large organizations a lot of difficulty. I also think we have trouble with the concept of an

entering professional level, whatever that is, and I think one of the reasons we are vulnerable to this de-professionalizing which is going on in different places is because we set that entering level too low. In many of our entry-level positions, a person with a good liberal arts education and some on-the-job training can do the job.

Jim Haas has mentioned that we are an aggregate of professions and I think that is another problem that we face. We want to bring in a specialist. They would not come in at the entry level, I hope. You enter the profession but you do not necessarily have to enter it at the low point. They enter the profession some place — we should get away from the idea of the entry level as being a low point. At Columbia we have a two-track system which is an attempt to deal with the situation in which you can have a satisfactory professional career either through the academic skills, practicing the bibliographic skills in the profession, or through managerial skills. We have to keep working toward a better mix of that in our organizations.

* * * * *

To conclude the discussion, Ms. McBurney asked for a show of hands from those present to indicate a level of concern with the following issues raised by the survey:

- Education vs. skills training — are internships the answer?
- Should ARL focus on mid-career rather than entry-level librarians? How acute is the need for middle managers?
- Can library schools teach in a one-year program what ARL directors require from entry-level librarians? Is a research librarianship "track" needed to meet our requirements?
- Are library school admissions standards rigorous enough? What can we do to change this?
- How can we improve our communication with library schools?
- Large research libraries have significantly different needs than medium-sized or smaller libraries. What are these needs? How can they be met?
- What action for ARL should the Task Force recommend to the Board?

BUSINESS MEETING

Election of Board Members

MS. DUNLAP: Jay Lucker, as Vice President, also served as chairman of the Nominating Committee. Jay, would you make your report at this time, please.

MR. LUCKER: You all should have received this announcement in the mail but I will read it for the record.

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, consisting of Rutherford Rogers, Allen Veaner, and myself as chair, we present for election to three-year terms on the ARL Board of Directors the following three individuals: Sterling J. Albrecht of Brigham Young University, James F. Govan of the University of North Carolina, and Donald W. Koepp of Princeton University.

PRESIDENT DUNLAP: Are there any nominations from the floor? Neither seeing nor hearing any, may I ask someone to move acceptance by acclamation?

A MEMBER: I so move.

PRESIDENT DUNLAP: Is there any objection? (No objection registered.) Congratulations, new Board Members.

Report of the Task Force on Bibliographic Control

MR. GOVAN (University of North Carolina): The Task Force on Bibliographic Control has asked for an extension of its tenure during this period of inordinate and significant activity in its area of responsibility and the Board of Directors has granted that extension. In the next two years the task force hopes to offer practical assistance to member libraries during the transition to AACR 2 and the implementation of the new standards related to that code.

During the past year, the task force monitored the Library Catalog Cost Model, developed for ARL by King Research, and reviewed the report prior to publication. In recent months, the task force has been collaborating with the headquarters staff on the creation of a SPEC Kit of impact studies on the adoption of the new code; that kit should be out soon. The memorandum calling for contributions to the SPEC Kit also solicited suggestions for other projects which the task force might undertake to assist the Membership in its adjustment to AACR 2, and we are still interested in additional suggestions.

The task force has discussed the CONSER project extensively in preparing the report distributed to you, and I presume that each of you has seen a copy of that document.* The task force members believe the CONSER project to be highly significant to our Membership and that ARL directors should be well informed about it in regard to both its potential benefits and its long-range problems.

*The Report on the CONSER Project appears on p. 78.

The project is important to research libraries because, among other contributions, it can produce a national serials data base and has established a model for authentication by contributing libraries applicable to the maintenance of other bibliographic standards. The task force's concern about the project at present, however, is that the group of contributing libraries contains affiliates of both OCLC and RLIN, so that the national serials data base is, in effect, being split. The present inability of these two utilities to exchange data has serious implications for any national cooperative effort to build data bases, especially if the effort's success depends on decentralization of authentication. The CONSER project is a real, immediate case in point, and we are asking the Membership to address this problem by passing the recommendations on page 6 of the CONSER Report.

Now, in case you do not have the report in hand, I will read those recommendations to you.

First, we are asking the Membership to endorse the resolution passed by the Technical Service Directors of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group ("Big Heads") in June 27, 1980. I hate that term; I wish they would find another name for themselves. I am going to have to read you the Big Heads Resolution, so bear with me.

"Therefore be it resolved that the national libraries, the academic and research libraries, members of ARL, and those libraries that are engaged in or about to undertake retrospective conversion of serials records projects be urged to encourage their respective networks, affiliates, and/or consortia to:

1. establish as immediate priority, an electronic interconnection between their networks that will provide their participants dynamic access to each other's serial data base, provide for file building and dynamic serial data exchange;
2. provide for a more timely distribution of national level (CONSER) serial records, and
3. promote the use of national level (CONSER) serial records through a carefully monitored quality assurance program.

Our second recommendation is to support current efforts at interim solutions for sharing data and encouraging CONSER participation, regardless of utility affiliation.

Our third recommendation is to support the Library of Congress's plan to decentralize authentication.

And our fourth recommendation is to: study the recommendations from the Council on Library Resources/Office of Education meeting in November 1979, and consider what further action might be appropriate now. This refers to a recommendation from that meeting that the CONSER standards be followed in all Title II-C projects having to do with serials conversion.

Madam Chairman, I would like to move the adoption of these four points.

MS. DUNLAP: As you are chairman of the task force, no second is needed. Is there any discussion?

MS. MARTIN: I have a question. I do not have the document in front of me and I would like to know if the LC plan for decentralization of authentication is included in the report?

MR. GOVAN: It is.

MS. MARTIN: Thank you.

MS. DUNLAP: Are there other questions or any discussion? Are you ready for the question? Those in favor? Any opposed? The motion is carried.

MR. GOVAN: Another area of increasing concern is the identification of an appropriate procedure for decisions governing bibliographic codes and standards. At present, pertinent groups within the American Library Association are making rulings on these matters without consultation with the bibliographic utilities, while the Library of Congress has the difficult task of attempting to cooperate with both parties. ARL opinion tends to be represented only through individual memberships on ALA committees and the task force's liaison with LC. On the face of it, this arrangement is not systematic management of a national code, and the results are apparent in the recent unhappy experience with the adoption of AACR 2. It is now clear that financial implications and users' behavior, as well as networking considerations, must join technical requirements in determining future decisions. The solution to this problem is all the more important in a machine environment where constant revision may well replace the adoption of new codes.

The task force is now beginning to discuss the fullness and character of bibliographic records which must be stored on-line. There is a strong likelihood that the finding list provided by a public catalog will be totally separate from the bibliographic descriptions provided by it. The costs of storage and the significantly heavier demand for the finding list, among other considerations, may force this division of functions; and the nature of the shorter record deserves careful study.

The Board of Directors has asked the Task Force to examine the question of cataloging microforms under AACR 2 and to make a recommendation to the Board about it. The Task Force is now studying the problem and intends to make a recommendation soon. Thank you.

Report on the Universal Serials and Book Exchange

MS. HARRAR (University of Maryland): ARL has a liaison to the Universal Serials and Book Exchange, otherwise known as USBE, and I am it, an august position which I have held for a number of years. This is the first time I have actually made a formal report to you on behalf of USBE.

I do not know whether you all are aware of the fact that of the ARL Membership, there are 106 members who are also members of USBE and, while that constitutes only 6% of the total membership in the exchange, we do account for approximately 25% of the total receipts in the USBE stock.

If you have been reading the flyers that come across your desks you know that the USBE use rate has declined rather dramatically in the last several years and that there have been efforts made to increase that use through short-term special price rates on individual periodical issues and the like. One of the factors that has helped in the last year or so is the letter that Lee Anderson, then the President of USBE, sent to members of ARL to encourage all of us to take greater advantage of USBE, using it not only as a means by which to find periodical issues that we needed for replacement purposes or filling in of back files but for interlibrary loan use and, while this has helped in some degree, there still could be considerably more use made of USBE by ARL members as well as by other member organizations.

I am going to give you a sales pitch for all of about 15 seconds. This year the Board increased USBE's membership fee for the first time in ten years. It went to \$50, a doubling of the price, and one would assume that this is value well received. At the moment, I think individual issue prices are \$2.75, and where can you do as well on the open market?

The Board and the USBE staff have been particularly interested in a couple of endeavors. The first is to increase membership. To that end, there is a new group rate for foreign libraries that is to be implemented for the first time in January of next year with a group of libraries in the People's Republic of China. The second endeavor is automation. Those of you who have visited the V Street warehouse are aware of the fact that this is a mammoth operation and still largely a manual one. There has been some talk for a number of years about the need to automate various portions of the function, including the inventory, and through the good offices of the Council on Library Resources, a study was conducted last year resulting in both short-range and long-range recommendations. The study has stimulated the development of a Request for Proposal now under way to seek the automating of some of the administrative functions as well as the inventory control itself. At the present time, a listing of the 10,000 titles in stock is being put into machine-readable form by Bibliographic Retrieval Services, Inc. (BRS) and it is hoped that by January of next year that listing will be available through at least two vendors. So you might pass that information on to the appropriate staff.

These are simply highlights. I would point out that there is a report a little bit longer than my remarks on the table at the back of the room. If you have specific questions, Alice Ball, the Executive Director of USBE, would be delighted to hear from you. Furthermore, Lee Anderson, the immediate Past President of USBE, is here, as is Margaret Otto, the President-Elect. Thank you very much.

Report on the ARL Bibliographic Control of Materials
in Microform Project

MR. BOSS (Information Systems Consultants, Inc): Even though we have submitted our final report to the Association of Research Libraries on the Bibliographic Access to Materials in Microform Project, there is not, I confess, a final resolution to the problem of bibliographic access to microforms. We are plagued with that which many of you find is plaguing you — AACR 2 — because there is not yet really a resolution of the problem of how AACR 2 will be used in handling bibliographic access to microforms.

But let me go through the recommendations in our report first and save until last this aspect of AACR 2 and an explanation of its effect on the situation. You have already heard before these recommendations because this has been an evolving study. We interviewed a large number of individuals to learn their attitudes about a particular aspect of a plan and then incorporated aspects that appeared to have broad support into the evolving tentative plan. We then used the tentative plan with the next group of interviewees, and so forth. We have interviewed several hundred persons in successive stages in the course of developing the plan as it appears in our report.

It was clear from the very beginning that almost no one among librarians, microform publishers, or the bibliographic utilities, wanted a program geared to the catalog card. Even though there might be a catalog card product, at least temporarily, there was clear evidence that people wanted to have bibliographic access to microforms based on a program of machine-readable information. Further, the libraries did not want to develop a separate, new mechanism for handling bibliographic access to microforms. They wanted to take advantage of the mechanisms that were already in place; the most popular mechanism was the existing major bibliographic utilities: OCLC, RLG, UTLAS, WLN. So it then became a question of how do we go about building a data base of bibliographic information about microforms, specifically monographs in microform collections, which are the primary concern of this particular project.

It seems obvious to us that it would not be possible for all that needed to be done to be accomplished by libraries alone. But we decided to be very careful in polling librarians and others to determine whether they shared this perception. We found only about 20 ARL libraries that were processing at least 2500 monographic titles in microform a year. Given the total amount being issued each year in microform and the total amount already held by the research libraries of the nation, it was not very practical to think of only those libraries already committing human and financial resources to the cataloging of microforms to take on the whole task.

One of the two other groups would have to be persuaded to pitch in: either libraries that had previously made no financial and staff commitments of any significance to the cataloging of microforms, or microform publishers. Microform publishers, especially the larger ones, were already doing a great deal of cataloging of microforms and selling catalog cards. Many were none too happy about being in the card catalog business, so it seemed that the wiser of the two options would be to direct the efforts of the microform publishers toward inputting records directly to bibliographic utility data bases. By having microform publishers and libraries that were already cataloging microforms shift that effort to input into OCLC, RLG, WLN, and UTLAS, we were not asking anyone to come up with new sources of monies or major reallocations of staff time.

In principle, this had wide support and therefore, in the final plan, is a recommendation that the primary emphasis for current sets be that the microform publishers enter records into the data bases of bibliographic utilities, providing that those records conform to the accepted nationwide bibliographic standards, and that records for the microform collections which are already in libraries be systematically added to these machine-readable data bases by the libraries. Those libraries that are already committing time to cataloging microforms would be especially urged to participate. Another facet would be to allocate the

responsibility for the sets that have been identified as the most important. In our report we cite the collections most frequently mentioned by libraries that are already doing a substantial amount of microforms cataloging as the titles they most wish to have processed. The hope is that between these two efforts, plus an effort on the part of libraries to do that current cataloging where the microform publishers cannot be persuaded to participate, we can begin to dig into this vast backlog of material.

I should mention that initially the concept was that only current microforms would be incorporated into the program, but we found in talking with librarians all over the country that they were as much, if not more, concerned about the holdings they already had. They sense a shift in the pattern of microform publishing and believe that a disproportionately large amount of the significant monographic literature has already been published in microform and is already in their collection. If that is neglected and only the new or future monographs are cataloged, these librarians believe they will not be as well served as they would be if the program had a mix of current and retrospective records.

We have talked with the bibliographic utilities and at least one of the utilities has indicated its willingness to accept the input of and pay a license fee to four microform publishers. That fee would be an attempt to compensate microform publishers for the loss of revenue which they are now getting from the sale of catalog cards. It would not be a royalty, a recurring payment based upon the number of uses of those bibliographic records, but rather a one-time fee which would be determined in negotiation between the bibliographic utility and the microform publishers.

A meeting was held between the two largest microform publishers, which between them account for nearly 45% of all of the monographs in microforms published this past year, and OCLC. Both microform publishers subsequently agreed to participate in the program. Our feeling was that the commitment of the two largest microform publishers, representing so large a percentage of the total number of microforms, with a bibliographic utility representing such a large percentage of the libraries currently committing a substantial amount of money and staff to microform cataloging would be sort of a catalyst to getting the rest of the utilities, publishers, and libraries into the program.

It seemed to us also important that there be a way of tying this program into the National Register for Microform Masters. We talked at some length to people at the New York Public Library to see if we could somehow link our two studies but, unfortunately, the timetables of the two studies are very different and just as we were concluding our study they were getting into high gear. The specific provision we suggest then, is that as a by-product of the creation of machine-readable records of monographs in microform, a record of any item processed which is designated as a microform be provided automatically to the National Register of Microform Masters or any later register. This could be sent from the bibliographic utility to the National Register as part of a routine process. Rather than having several hundred publishers and several hundred libraries each responsible for reporting, a few bibliographic utilities could make that a routine part of their machine processing of these records and thus, we hope, a more reliable reporting mechanism.

In the course of our study, we found, in talking with people, that there was a great deal of concern that this program not be just left up to chance. Rather, if

individuals and institutions agree that it is a good idea, they should go ahead and do it. Even a good thing takes some pushing, some incentive to get people to participate on an ongoing basis. Witness the experience with the Cataloging in Publication (CIP) program. It took a staff of seven people about three years to contact the publishers and others in order to get CIP going. Now, the microform publishing industry is smaller; there are less publishers and a larger percentage of the total production is concentrated in a handful of publishers. We, nevertheless, suggest that management of the program be similar to that for CIP, in order to undertake that repeated contact that may be necessary to get the participants involved in the program. We recommend that there be a sponsoring agency for such program management. We talked with a large number of people, not just librarians but microform publishers and people in bibliographic utilities, about who might be the sponsoring agency. The Association of Research Libraries was recommended ahead of the other alternatives for a number of reasons:

1. ARL has a history of interest in bibliographic access to microforms; the Association has sponsored three studies on the topic.
2. ARL has a history of successful project administration.
3. ARL is an association which has both Canadian and U.S. representatives. There is a great deal of interest in the problem of bibliographic access to microforms in Canada and many of those to whom we spoke felt that an agency that had both U.S. and Canadian ties would be important in such a program.

Also, we believed that the program ought to have some independence and discussed this in interviews. It was felt that ARL would allow such independence. In fact, the only concern expressed was some uncertainty due to the current search for a permanent executive director. Barring that uncertainty, people were very ready to have ARL be the sponsoring agency, and I think that may have influenced comments about the kind of governance structure. We talked about a board and we got very mixed reactions as to whether that should be an advisory board to ARL or whether it should be an independent board that could push this program along in case at any point along the way the ARL leadership lacked the interest or the push to keep this program going. This is one of the uncertain areas in our study.

It was obvious, however, that among all of the sectors that we polled that any board, regardless of its composition, ought to be broadly representative of the interested parties, not to be just composed of representatives of ARL libraries which do a substantial amount of microform cataloging. It ought to include one or more individuals from non-ARL libraries for whom microforms represent a significant percentage of the collection, representation from microform publishers, and representation from at least the two largest bibliographic utilities in terms of membership of libraries which are already doing a great deal of microforms cataloging, OCLC and RLIN.

We put together a package with these various elements in the final report that will be distributed to you by mail in the near future. But then we ran into a very critical issue indeed. We had early on in the study determined that LC's proposals for providing for the adequate description of microforms, the 007 field, had wide support and that LC's proposal for a revised 534 bibliographic note that would

provide for the description of the original when one was cataloging a microform copy had mixed reception. There were a number of people who had very strong feelings that AACR 2's provision for cataloging the item in hand was unacceptable. These people believed that instead the microform ought to be described in a note, with the original edition from which the microform had been reproduced described in the body of the cataloging record. This division of opinion has been one of the difficult issues, and proved to be the unresolvable issue in the course of our study.

There were a number of meetings at which individuals sought to influence first the ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, then the Joint Steering Committee of AACR 2, then the Library of Congress, to interpret AACR 2 in a different way so that the original publication could be described in the body of the bibliographic record. None of those efforts were successful.

On July 25, 1980, there was a meeting at the Library of Congress involving a number of the proponents of this approach of describing the original in the body of the record. Approximately three weeks later the Library of Congress released a statement clarifying their plans for handling microforms. Since almost all the microforms they process are for preservation of material already in the collection, with a note added to the existing bibliographic record, and virtually no cataloging of commercially produced microforms, they would continue their current practice rather than adopting AACR 2 provisions for these materials, while microform publishers, bibliographic utilities, and the libraries cataloging commercially produced microforms decided how to handle the problem of describing microforms. The Library would be prepared to go to the Joint Steering Committee for AACR 2 with a recommendation that AACR 2 as written not be used for the descriptive cataloging of microforms.

The bibliographic utilities began to contemplate how they should proceed. The option for treatment of microforms that appeared to have the most support among the parties involved was the approach developed by Charles Willard of the Princeton Theological Seminary. Willard recommended that in this case, cataloging from the copy-in-hand be dropped in favor of cataloging from the original of a publication. We have so far not realized a meeting of the four bibliographic utilities where they might agree on a common approach in order to avoid, if possible, different solutions by the four utilities which would make the exchange of data among the utilities difficult because of various interpretations of an AACR 2 that had been substantially rejected, at least with regard to descriptive cataloging of microforms. We recommended that ARL act to bring the bibliographic utilities together, not to impose on them a particular solution, but rather to urge on them that any solution be one that they undertake after collective deliberation. The ARL Executive Committee decided in September to communicate the Association's concern to the four utilities, and to express the desire that the utilities meet and seek a collective solution. The major microform publishers have communicated to the utilities that, if they achieve a common solution, the publishers, which are currently producing cataloging records for over 55,000 monographic titles in microforms annually, would follow that decision.

Now everyone is waiting anxiously to see whether there will be one decision or many on the interpretation of AACR 2, or the rejection of AACR 2 provisions for descriptive cataloging of microforms. Our final report leaves us sort of in limbo and my concluding remark is just to paraphrase an excerpt from a letter written by Fred

Kilgour to the president of one of the major microform publishers: We are most interested in responding positively to your proposal to input your bibliographic records into OCLC with the stipulation that we will make these available not only to our own members but also to libraries that are not members of OCLC and also to other bibliographic utilities, but we feel we cannot proceed until the issue of AACR 2 with regard to microforms is resolved. And so I fear we have delivered the third in a series of reports on bibliographic access to microforms with this issue close to a resolution but not quite there.

MS. DUNLAP: The Board has received Dick's report and has not yet had time to give full consideration to all of the issues and recommendations. It will be working on the report very carefully and immediately. In the meantime, are there any questions that you would like to address to Dick?

MR. STUART-STUBBS (University of British Columbia): Sometimes my name sounds like an institution. I may be seeking a clarification here and I may simply be muddying the waters, but in relation to this business of AACR 2, as I understand it, we are talking about developing a data base relating to microforms. We can extract from that data base any kind of information, subject to programming, and display it in any way we want. I believe the issue of standards is really not at the AACR 2 level but it is at the programming and input levels. Once you have made your description, your output from a data base would be much simpler, from the utilities point of view, if everybody used the same number.

Is that really the problem, Dick?

MR. BOSS: Yes and no. The LC revised 534 field solution would put into the data base of a bibliographic utility all of the informational components that would be there were the so-called Willard proposal adopted. Only the arrangement of those informational components would be the same as with the current AACR 2 provisions. The fear is that in producing records from the bibliographic utilities, whether on cards or on magnetic tape, libraries would follow their traditional pattern of producing the cards in that same sequence rather than rearranging the information. The body of the card would be based on the imprint fields and the information about the original edition from which the microform was drawn would be in the note field at the bottom of the card. In the machine-readable record, information about the original would come late in the record and, in the creation of brief records for user access on-line catalogs, libraries might trim off the notes.

Some have argued that it is possible to manipulate the record and choose what you would put on the card or what you would put in a COM catalog or put in an on-line catalog. The counter argument, as I understand it, is that the choice tends to be made on the basis of traditional practice, and traditional practice would have the result of creating records which would present users, who are accustomed to finding information about the hard copy printed publication in the imprint area, with an unfamiliar situation in which that information is given in a note. Also, it is possible that a trimmed record for a COM or on-line catalog would drop that note information completely.

MR. STUART-STUBBS: I hope that cleared some things up for people. I would be personally interested to see a show of hands on that preference among ARL directors.

MR. BOSS: Before you do that, let me mention two other things.

We felt the resolution of the AACR 2 issue was so complex and that there are so many parties with vested interests, that the fight is going to last much longer than the amount of time available to us. Microform publishers who are going to market sets of microforms in 1981 have to do the cataloging in late 1980, so they are going to make a decision, which means that large numbers of libraries are going to buy catalog copy with the 1981 microform publications and use it in their libraries, based on whatever the microform publishers have decided to do. Our specific recommendation is that the 534 field be adopted as an alternative, with the stipulation not that we like it but as it is going to be easier to go from one machine-controlled solution as an interim solution to a permanent solution than to go from what we feared would be many interim solutions.

While a majority of those we interviewed seemed to concur in that particular view, we found that the majority of those who occupy key positions in the Joint Steering Committee of AACR 2, the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, and other ALA committees, etc., have a contrary view. There is a difference between a majority of the community at large and a majority of the community who have particularly involved themselves in the decision-making processes. I think you ought to keep in mind as you poll this group that the results of one group and another group may very much be at odds.

MR. STUART-STUBBS: Another observation, if I may be permitted one. The video disk is coming down the line. We will soon have a disk which has one publisher but contains the works of 150 other publishers. There are some nightmarish issues yet to be resolved.

I would also like to take a little more time, if I may, as one of the members of the Project's Advisory Committee, to thank Dick and to praise him for having done such a comprehensive job in solving or at least beginning to approach some of the solutions to a very complex series of problems. I would also like to thank a couple of other colleagues here in the room for their interest in this, Allen Veaner and Grey Cole, both of whom have long written on this subject and have attempted to make of microforms something less than second class citizens in our libraries. I also observe that both of them, for their pains, have earned perhaps the thickest eyeglasses of the whole audience — which may say something about microforms. Thank you.

Report of the Office of Management Studies

MR. WEBSTER: This will be a brief report on the highlights of OMS activities over the last six months and I would like to encourage you to direct any questions to any of the OMS staff about the resources and services available to you from the Office. We are quite eager to talk about how your problems and interests can be dealt with or handled with some of the tools and services we have available.

Presently we have 17 self-studies operating within the framework of the Academic Library Program. There are now self-study resources available in the areas of collections management, planning, reorganization, and staff development.

In the last few months, Temple and Syracuse completed reorganization studies and have moved to the implementation phase of those efforts. Case Western Reserve completed their collection study and are using their report as a tool in a fund-raising effort. Illinois moved through the collection study and is now nearing completion and Maryland, British Columbia, Notre Dame, and McGill all began the collection study in the last several weeks. I might also add that, as part of the Academic Library Program, the OMS is prepared to provide consultative assistance to any ARL member interested in planning or operating an internal study, whether as part of one of our self-study methods, or as a separate process, perhaps briefer or more specifically focused on an internal problem.

The Academic Library Consultant Training Program also received a lot of our attention in the last few months. Ten of the consultant trainees completed their practicums and four of them are currently acting as principal consultants for the Small Library Planning Program. The remaining ten consultants are either currently engaged in a co-consulting capacity with OMS staff or have been assigned to a project which will begin before the end of the year. We have also begun the selection process for the second group of consultants. We received 159 applications and nine regional interviews have been scheduled for us to meet directly with 67 individuals. The interviewing teams for those regional sessions will be made up of OMS staff and members of the OMS Advisory Committee. I might also observe that the majority of participants in this program are from ARL member libraries and that the consultation experience is proving uniquely valuable to these individuals in the development of the analytical and problem-solving skills that they can take back to their own home institution and apply in their regular assignments.

The Preservation Project, supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities, was another focus of our attention during this last period. Pamela Darling began working full-time as the OMS Preservation Specialist, and she and I have been working closely since the onset of this project, in spite of the fact that we are located at different locations. She is maintaining an office in New York and is finding that a very successful way of getting a lot of work done. I would like Pam to briefly update the directors on the status of that project.

MS. DARLING: You will recall that the purpose of the project is to develop the managerial tools that you will need to analyze preservation needs and develop or expand programs to meet those needs. This process will be chiefly one of synthesis rather than creation, because a great deal of development of procedures, techniques, and preservation planning approaches have already taken place in libraries around the country.

An early phase of the project involved the SPEC survey conducted by the Office last spring. A two-foot stack of material came back as a result of that survey and the first of a projected three kits on planning for preservation was distributed in August. Two more will appear this winter. Meanwhile, all of that material is also being incorporated into a substantial information file which will be the basis for the manuals we will produce.

As we conceive it now, there will be two documents: a technical procedural manual, which will present current technical information on a wide range of preservation topics, together with procedural models for applying that information within the library, and an assisted self-study manual similar to the CAP manual to

shape the local planning process keyed to the technical procedural manual. Drafting of the manuals has begun and should be completed shortly after Christmas. The materials will then be tested in three pilot libraries.

We have received 17 applications for participation in the pilot test and expect to complete the selection next month. The criteria for selecting the test sites were developed during our Advisory Committee meeting in August. That committee will also assist us with reviewing the draft documents before testing, analyzing the test results and incorporating improvements in the final manuals, and considering next steps to ensure effective use of the materials once the project concludes in December of next year.

Let me take this opportunity to thank you all for the support and cooperation you have generously offered thus far and to ask that you keep me informed of any new developments in preservation within your libraries. If there are any questions, I would be glad to answer them.

MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Pam. In addition to Pam's presence, there have been other personnel changes in the office. Our new Training Program Coordinator, Maureen Schechter, joined the Office in August. In case you have not yet had a chance to meet Maureen, she is now ready to work on the identification of training programs that might be useful in your own organizational setting. She worked with us on a Management Skills Institute earlier this summer and has put together a schedule of training events in 1981 which include four Management Skills Institutes: Austin, Texas in April, Toronto in July, Washington in November, and an Advanced Management Skills Institute, also in Washington in November.

In addition to those four institutes, we are initiating a new training activity, Management Resource Workshops, which will be single-day activities — not workshops aimed at skill-building per se, but rather an opportunity to introduce librarians, supervisors, and staff development officers to the range of management resources, techniques, ideas that can help them do a better job in their own situations. Three of those workshops will be operated in the next year: San Francisco in March, St. Louis in May, and Boston in October. The Office is also prepared to conduct on-site Management Skills Institutes for any member library if a minimal registration of at least 15 is assured. This saves travel costs for the participants and allow us to cover the direct costs of conducting an institute.

The other major personnel change was the departure of the Small Library Planning Program Coordinator, Grady Morein, who left to become Director at the Evansville University Library. We have not filled this position because the program is close to completion and because we want to clearly establish the funding and future role of that position; the OMS Advisory Committee is working with us in determining what should be done with that position. Instead of restaffing, we are using the consultant trainees to complete the required studies and, in addition, we are reassigning some responsibilities within the OMS staff. One consequence of this reassignment is a delay in the design and the development of the Public Services Study Program.

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center continues a demanding schedule. Recent flyers and kits have covered the topics of retrospective

conversion, indirect cost rates, collective bargaining, library affirmative action programs, and planning for preservation.

Finally, the Office works closely with the OMS Advisory Committee in order to respond to your needs and your interests. I urge that your comments and suggestions on these activities be directed to any member of that committee and in particular to its chairman, Irene Hoadley.

I cannot complete this report without acknowledging the insights and generous support that Ralph McCoy has provided us in this last year. Ralph is one of those classic managers who has a real intuitive knack for identifying issues and pushing for the best results. It has been a special opportunity for all of us at the Association to work with him.

Report of the Committee on a National Periodicals System

MR. SCHMIDT (Brown University): Some years ago Joe Jeff stood before this group and described a national periodicals lending library as the lovely unicorn and characterized us as in pursuit of it. We are still, almost ten years later, in pursuit and I fear that we have not come much closer to capturing it than we did earlier on.

The committee has prepared a formal report that will appear in the Minutes of this meeting.* I will be meeting with the Board later today to discuss that report, but I would like to review with you the recommendations that the committee is making. I will precede that by risking a belaborment of the obvious and review the status of the legislation that we were trying to get passed.

The Education Amendments of 1980 were passed by the House in September 1979 and by the Senate in June of 1980. There was a Conference Committee which finally produced a report. The House adopted that report on the 18th of September 1980, the Senate on the 25th of September 1980, and the conference bill has since been signed into law by the President. The bill contains a Part D in Title II of the Higher Education Act which authorized the establishment of a National Periodical System Corporation to investigate the advisability and feasibility of a National Periodical System, and to develop and propose to Congress for its approval an operating plan for that system. However, before funds for Part D can be appropriated, funding for Parts A, B, and C must be at the fiscal '79 level. For those of you who may not remember the numbers, the funding level for Part A is currently at approximately half of the fiscal '79 level.

We concluded our meeting in September with a critique of our legislative strategy, trying to identify where we had come a cropper, to the extent we had, and we are going to be making the following recommendations to the Board:

*The annual report of the ARL Committee on a National Periodical System is on p. 71.

1. That ARL, working with the American Council on Education and other appropriate organizations, make recommendations to the Department of Education as it prepares and publishes regulations for Title II-D. (There seems to be some uncertainty about whether the Department will, in fact, have to prepare regulations for Title II-D regardless of whether it is funded. Some information we have received indicates that they will have to pursue that regulation-making and others suggest that they may not. But, in any event, our notion is that if they do, we ought to be involved in the development of those regulations.)
2. That ARL continue to support full appropriations for Parts A, B, and C of the Higher Education Act, and be alert to opportunities to fund Part D.
3. That ARL create a joint committee with the Center for Research Libraries to develop a plan and secure funding to establish a National Periodical Lending Service at the Center for Research Libraries.
4. As a by-product of our work on this matter over the last three years, we strongly urge that the Board approve the reestablishment of a Federal Relations Committee and the creation of a Federal Relations Network.

Having presented the set of recommendations the committee will make to the Board, let me touch on another issue, which may appear to you at first glance to be unrelated, but, I think, is not as unrelated as it appears.

There was on the table this morning a handout for you regarding the IRS regulation with respect to publishers' warehouse inventories of books. The Board yesterday passed a resolution regarding what has come to be known as the Thor Power Tool Company v. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue decision, instructing that a letter be sent to the Congress urging passage of appropriate legislation to rectify what appears to be an unfortunate turn of events by the IRS. It seemed to us in our committee meeting this morning that it might be appropriate to have such a letter bear the full force of the Membership of the ARL, and that the communication we send in this regard to the Congress also be sent to the Association of American Publishers (AAP) as perhaps an opening step into a dialogue which might subsequently turn to such issues as the problems that we are facing with the cancellations of journals, quite irrespective of whether a National Periodical System and/or Center is established. So your committee thought that it might be useful for the Membership to adopt a resolution requesting the Board to seek congressional action to overturn the IRS regulation with respect to the inventory of books. I hope that you would be ready to do this. I have one more item to take up but will step aside if somebody wants to spontaneously introduce a resolution along the lines that I have suggested.

MS. DUNLAP: Do you want to move it as the chairman of the committee?

MR. SCHMIDT: I am advised by the Parliamentarian here that that might be a good thing to do. I move that the membership go on record as recommending

appropriate congressional action to change the IRS decision in re Thor Power Tool Company v. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

MR. GOVAN: Second.

MS. DUNLAP: Is there discussion?

MS. ECHELMAN (Medical Library Association): I am the Executive Director of the Medical Library Association, so I am here on your sufferance and as a guest. May I suggest that you make it quite clear in that resolution you are discussing not only what is going to happen in the future but the retrospective aspects of it as well, because the IRS is applying this ruling back to the beginning of 1979.

MS. DUNLAP: Amendment accepted, Mr. Schmidt says.

MR. FRANTZ: If this passes, the committee might consider whether it would like to send a copy of the resolution to Senator Moynihan, who has said one of the first things he is going to do is to introduce legislation to correct this. Of course, the retrospective aspect is still a problem.

MS. DUNLAP: If I may interject, I would like to suggest also that in addition to the resolution passed by the Association, if it chooses to do so, I would strongly urge each and every one of you to write to your own congressmen, both senators and representatives, and write also to Senator Russell Long, who is Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and to Senator Moynihan. I think a resolution will have a certain impact but I think the real impact will come from a lot of letters from each of you. Now, is there further discussion on the resolution?

MS. MARTIN: In your initial statement of the resolution, Jim, you said something about contacting AAP. As stated when you moved the resolution, you did not mention that portion of it. I would consider a legislative approach and an approach to AAP as being two distinct actions, and perhaps to be done with rather different tones. Could you clarify that?

MR. SCHMIDT: I will try, Sue. The committee had really two thoughts on the Thor Power Tool issue. The first was that it would be useful, over and above the action taken by the Board yesterday authorizing a letter to be sent urging congressional action, that similar action have the imprimatur of the Membership at large, adding, we thought, some additional force and power to the worth of that resolution.

Secondly, we surmised that to take such a step would give us perhaps an entre into some kind of dialogue with the AAP that might move to issues more directly of concern to the Committee on a National Periodical System. Initially we hope that the dialogue could engage the issue of the inevitable cancellations that we are all facing, and try to establish some kind of understanding that would take subsequent discussions, if such there be, about a National Periodical System and/or Center out of the rhetorical context of cancellations. It is our conviction in the committee that the cancellations are a constant, that they have occurred in the recent past, that they will likely continue to occur in the foreseeable future, with or without a viable National Periodical Lending Service, federally or nonfederally funded. Is that responsive?

MS. MARTIN: We are talking now about just a letter to congressional committees?

MR. SCHMIDT: No. If that is your question, I am not talking now just about a letter to congressional committees. I am also talking about an indication that this Association supports a change, and communicating that fact to AAP as well.

MS. DUNLAP: Several of us, I know, a couple of weeks ago wrote to our own congressmen and to Senator Long urging them to support legislation that would exempt publishers from the provision of the present IRS 8060 and any future regulations of that kind. At the same time I wrote to Tim Hoopes, President of the AAP, letting him know that librarians were beginning to pick this up and support him, and also to let him know that we were going to ask the ARL Membership to not only write to their own congressmen but also to support a strong resolution in favor of legislation that would exempt publishers, quite frankly, partly as a political move, and partly because we really believe it. We have been at odds with the AAP on some very substantial issues of recent date — e.g., the National Periodical Center, copyright — and our relationships with publishers can only be enhanced by our support in this matter. It is for our own good as well, but I think it will enhance our relationship with them and then perhaps they will respond in kind. We will communicate with them further after this meeting to be sure.

Is there any further discussion? Those in favor? Opposed. (The motion was passed.)

MR. SCHMIDT: My thanks to you and, if you will indulge me for another moment, as I indicated, I will be reporting on behalf of the committee to the Board this evening. One of the recommendations that we will make is to establish a joint committee with the Center to develop a plan and secure funding to establish a National Periodical Lending Service at the Center. That aside, it occurred to us that as this joint committee gets under way it will wish to have some kind of data of a sort that we have not yet gathered. So in its discussions this morning, the committee suggested that I might impose upon you for two minutes to conduct yet another in what appears to be a series of straw votes today. I will try to do this as expeditiously as I can.

There are three questions that I distilled from our discussion this morning and I want to see if I can get some sense from you about whether data to answer these questions can be gathered. Whether in fact we do gather it is another matter to be debated subsequently. The questions are:

How many of you have now in process and/or have in the past five years had in process a serials cancellations enterprise? Could I see a show of hands? (A showing of a majority of hands.)

MS. DUNLAP: Maybe you should ask who has not; it would be easier to count.

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes. The President has suggested I go at it the other way. Are there any here who have not had to suffer that ordeal? (A showing of approximately 6 hands.)

The second question is, and it follows upon an affirmative response to the first, how many of you have, or could gather if asked, data regarding the number of

subscription titles and dollar values of these cancellations? (A showing of a majority of hands.)

Let me try the reverse of that question. For those of you who have engaged in such, how many of you could not? (A showing of approximately 6 hands.)

All right. Here comes the kicker in the enterprise. Would you be willing, if we called upon you?

A VOICE: Sure.

MR. SCHMIDT: All right. Thank you. I am done. Oh, I should say we will recommend that the Board discharge the committee and reconstitute the joint committee.

MS. DUNLAP: Thank you, Jim.

Report on the Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue

MS. DUNLAP: It is a very real pleasure to be able to introduce to you Henry Snyder, who is the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Louisiana State University and also the Editor of the Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue (ESTC), North American edition. Dr. Snyder.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you. I very much appreciate the opportunity to visit with you and give you a progress report on ESTC, a project in which I devoutly hope you are all eagerly interested and, for those of you who have not already responded to my invitation, ready to participate. A little bit of history first.

The Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue is one of those substantial reference tools for which scholars have longed without any hope of realization. Ever since the completion of the first edition of Pollard and Redgrave's Short Title Catalog in 1926, there have been plans about extending this bibliographic tool forward in time. The bold sequel by Donald Wing for the second half of the seventeenth century pointed the way. Its three volumes published between 1945 and 1951 are a remarkable achievement considering the fact that the number of entries exceeds those in the STC by a considerable factor. But the increased publishing activity in the eighteenth century, after the lapse of press censorship in 1695, put that task beyond the mechanical hand-compiled individual process employed on the pre-1700 projects. Not until the development of the computer were scholars able to address this daunting project realistically.

Suggestions from British Library officers to the American Society for Eighteenth Century Studies in the mid-'70s resulted in the London Conference of 1976 to discuss the feasibility of an Eighteenth Century Short Title Catalogue. This was followed by a Washington Conference later the same year. The British Library had meantime engaged Dr. Robin Alston to explore the concept. His survey of the works of Addison in libraries on both sides of the Atlantic demonstrated clearly that the dispersal of eighteenth century imprints was such that only a large-scale international bibliographic project could bring the material under control so that scholars could access all the material relevant to their work.

Initially it was proposed to convert the British Library Catalog, the National Union Catalog, and Evans and Tremain to machine-readable form. Pilot projects at the British Library and the New York Public Library quickly revealed the inadequacy of these tools for producing accurate and full bibliographic records. The availability of some specially appropriated funds emboldened the Director General of the Reference Division at the British Library, Donovan Richnell, to set a bibliographically sound project in motion. Engaging Dr. Alston to head the project, he committed the British Library to recataloging its eighteenth century holdings in machine-readable form. This file would form the basis of ESTC. Beyond that, the Library is committed also to supervise the development of the enriched file. Eventually, the British Library expects to expend about \$10 million on this project, to give you a little idea of the scale of investment on the other side of the Atlantic.

Because of this action and the fact that there was no parallel effort or even plan in North America, the design of the ESTC, the form of the record adopted, the material to be included were all decided at the British Library. Fortunately, the decisions were sensible and could be readily adopted by other potential collaborators. The American members of the Coordinating Committee proceeded to designate a project director to build a file of North American imprints, Marcus McCorison of the American Antiquarian Society (AAS), and another to collect records on English imprints in North American libraries. Armed with this latter charge, I submitted a proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Mellon Foundation in October of 1978 to fund the first triennium of the American effort. These two projects were funded in August 1979.

The current goals of the joint projects are to produce a COM catalog of the British Library's ESTC holdings in 1982 and an enriched COM, including holdings on both sides of the Atlantic, in 1986. I am pleased to say that all three coordinated efforts are well on schedule. The British Library had cataloged and keyed in 110,000 titles by July 1980. A careful examination of their catalog indicates 52,000 records remain to be completed. Estimating completion in the fall of 1981, the British Library will take another year to edit the records and will publish its COM in 1982 as planned. It will probably come out very close to the end of 1982. The editing is really a matter of ordering the records in the proper sequence rather than correcting the data that has been put into the file. The AAS will complete the recataloging of its North American holdings in full AACR 2 format by early 1983. In a planned second triennium, AAS will add holdings from other American locations and titles from other libraries. This phase will be conducted according to the procedures developed by the British Library and employed at the ESTC headquarters for North America in Baton Rouge.

We began employing staff in October of 1979 and reached our full complement of 3 full-time professional librarians on July 1 of this year. With the addition of a half-time graduate assistant, work-study students, volunteers, and other student employees, we now have up to 13 or 14 individuals working on some days on our project. Our spacious quarters, generously made available in the badly overcrowded main library at Louisiana State University — and we are extraordinarily grateful to George Guidry for his support — is getting to have the appearance of a sweatshop.

We have been soliciting North American libraries for records since June 1979. The canvass began in earnest only in 1980 and we are canvassing for records both for ESTC and the North American Imprints Project in the belief that, a) you would

only want to be bothered once and, b) if we could persuade you to go through an imprint file or a chronological file or a shelf list, you certainly were not going to go through it twice, so we had better ask you to get all the records for us in one sweep. I am pleased to report that more than 150 libraries have already agreed to contribute and more than half of that number have already submitted records. We have approximately 200,000 records in one form or another and we are processing them, that is to say checking them against the file and where they match noting locations, where they do not match holding them for further checking. Eventually we hope to key them in at the rate of up to 4,000 a week. Last week we processed 4,176 records, with three full-time staff members and student assistants. That is most exciting to us as it meets and even exceeds the level of productivity we established for ourselves in our proposal to the NEH and Mellon.

Currently we check records against the manual file, a photoreproduction of the cataloging records prepared by the British Library of its holdings. Our original plan was to convert to computer searching of the data base constructed by the British Library in our second triennium, which would have meant beginning in the fall of 1982. We have now accelerated that schedule. A supplementary grant from the NEH has enabled us to contract with the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN) to mount the British Library tape. We hope to take delivery on terminals at the beginning of 1981 and begin a pilot run of keying in records not in the British Library to establish the procedures to be employed after the British Library file is completed in mid-1981. By late spring we expect to begin searching against the records key-boarded to date at the British Library. As soon as we request it, the British Library will provide us with a tape of the records they have key-boarded so far and then will keep it up to date for us until they complete that key-boarding. So this will enable us to speed up the rate by which we search and record information.

By the fall of 1981 we should be essentially functioning in the manner we will continue to employ until the project is completed. From the time the incomplete file is mounted at RLIN it will be available to RLIN members and on a search only basis for contributing libraries who have made arrangements to use the file through ESTC/NA. Any library that is contributing to that data base will be permitted access to the file. They will simply go through us for certification that they are a contributor and then individual arrangements will be made for them with RLIN. Most libraries will have terminals which can communicate with RLIN on an item by item basis. Analytical searches will also be possible by special arrangement.

This long-dreamed-of reference research tool will be available to use on a schedule that exceeded any of our expectations. As we continue to add holdings and new records, its usefulness, in turn, will continue to grow. By contracting with RLIN this early, we have also made it possible for American scholars and librarians to gain access to the data at an earlier date than first envisaged. Our own initiative has forced the British to extend a similar service to their scholars. They had not planned to let them look at it till 1983, and now a year and a half earlier they are going to have to revise their arrangements.

How long is this project going to last? Our present funding extends to October 1982. The project as submitted assumes funding to at least October 1985. Clearly, the project will not be finished even then. We hope to explore means to keep it going even on an attenuated basis for a longer period in order to make the file as comprehensive as possible. At this time we still have no concrete idea as to the

ultimate size of the file either in the number of records or locations. Our current estimate is that it will eventually contain between 500,000 and 600,000 titles. Remember, the British Library has 162,000 titles. A survey of major libraries conducted by Tom Adams several years ago suggested that there were approximately 1,300,000 copies of English eighteenth century publications in this country, and some 200,000 North American publications. They have estimated as many as 5 million copies in the British Isles. I think that their estimate is high; I think that our estimate is low. Even though it is an estimate or "guestimate" by the libraries that submitted data, in many cases that survey was far from complete. A few of the libraries possibly overestimated their strength but I do not think many, and I know that there are many, many libraries around this country with ESTC material that were not included.

When I went to the Rare Books Pre-Conference in San Antonio, I went to see an exhibit that the other librarians attended in Trinity College's library of rare books from the various libraries in San Antonio. Among them was a collection from San Antonio College. It was a Eustace Budgell collection. Now, for those of you that are not eighteenth century scholars, Eustace Budgell was a very minor political writer of the 1720s. The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature lists only 16 titles under his entry. The Eustace Budgell collection of San Antonio College has 5,000 items in it. It must be the largest Eustace Budgell collection in the world, and is impossible to duplicate. And it is a collection about which we had not even inquired.

Or the Sutro Library in California. Some of you may know the Sutro, a really superb library, inadequately supported. It belongs to the city and county of San Francisco. Among other things it has some of the papers of Sir Joseph Banks, the naturalist and President of the Royal Society, and in those papers there are quite a number of broadsides. I have had a volunteer going through the broadside collection, which is uncataloged, and we found, for example, eight broadsides advertising prize oxen in Northern England in the late 1790s with manuscript annotations as to the date and place of the showing, and in some cases the printer. We found a similar group of broadsides for prize sheep and for prize hogs. We found another batch for draining the fens. I gave Robin Alston copies of these items. So far as we are aware, many of these items are probably unique. For the study of animal husbandry, for the study of job printing, for the study of popular entertainment (because that is what these showings were) — this is going to give information that nobody even dreamed was available and, as I said, it is an uncataloged collection.

We have another problem still with the Sutro. They have somewhere between 10,000 and 15,000 eighteenth century imprints. Part of the collection was cataloged by a WPA worker in the '30s with pencil single copy slips. The rest of it is uncataloged. So we have the problem of how we are going to get the records in the Sutro Library, which we have yet to solve. But we do have the broadsides on the prize oxen.

There is another point I want to make, too. Some libraries write back to me and say, we do not need to report because we do not have any unique material. That is not the case and I want to say that very emphatically. We are trying to make copies of books in your collections available to readers. Maybe your copies are not unique, but the fact that there is a copy at the National Library of Scotland is not terribly useful for a scholar working in Kingsville, Texas. If there is a copy of that book in San Antonio, that is much more important to that scholar.

Beyond that, we are dealing with hand-printed books and, as you are all unfortunately aware, very few of those books are ever the same. I remember just a very minor political publication, volume 3 of the Annals of the Reign of Queen Anne, published in 1705. I saw a notice in Studies in Bibliography about two different states of this volume. Halfway through the printing an extra gathering was added because the writer obtained some more information about a series of political events, which, as a Queen Anne historian, was of interest to me. I was then at the University of Kansas, so I took the article down to the rare books librarian. I had a copy, they had two, because I had bought two copies for them, and we had another copy on microfilm. We checked all six copies of volume 3 of the Annals of the Reign of Queen Anne. Only two were identical. In other words, there were five different states of that item, and several included significant additions of text.

It is important to let us know all of the eighteenth century books you have, not just those that you think are particularly rare or perhaps unique, because when the scholars get to working on that material they want to know about where other copies are available so they can check against them.

Our present intent is to process between 500,000 and 750,000 records in the two triennia and to key in some 50,000 to 100,000 titles. If additional resources are found to augment those already in existence or contemplated, it may be possible to add to that estimate. It depends, of course, on the support of contributing libraries in making the records available to us. The preferred method is to submit photoreproductions of title pages together with pagination and shelf list data. We also accept volunteer bibslips, catalog cards, and even printed catalogs, provided that the data is sufficiently complete and accurate.

We recognize that it is far easier for some libraries to access their ESTC items than others. The very great general collections at libraries such as Harvard, Michigan, and the University of California at Berkeley, will require a large-scale search through the shelf list to retrieve these records. The more specialized collections, especially those with imprint or chronological files, present less of a problem. I believe many libraries should and would probably like to retrieve this material from general collections and put it in a special collections department. The eighteenth century material has become so extraordinarily valuable in the last ten years that you really can not afford to allow unlimited access to it, so perhaps this will be a spur or a means of allowing you to make that kind of search. I was just talking to Hendrik Edelman about Rutgers; that is exactly what this project has provided for them.

I am pleased to report that so many libraries have already found it possible to make their records available to us at no cost or only modest expense to the ESTC. We have no substantial fund to pay for the cost of collecting the data. We can provide limited assistance to film records where necessary, and we are considering a program for funding the searching of shelf lists by student workers operating under the supervision of the professional staff at the contributing libraries. I will keep in touch with your organization on that subject. We do urge those libraries that can make their records available to us now to do so as soon as possible so that we can maintain a good backlog of work for our staff.

Like all major endeavors of this kind, its success rests on the efforts of countless numbers of friends and supporters. We believe that it is worth the effort,

yours and ours, to bring it to fruition. We are building a bibliographic and reference tool of extraordinary value. It will revolutionize eighteenth century scholarship far beyond what even Wing or the STC has been able to do because of its machine-readable format that will allow searching and analytical studies those other tools allow only after a very cumbersome, time-consuming procedure.

We hope that all of you will be able to and will want to participate. I have contacted each of you by mail and I have contacted as many as I can in person. I will be making follow-up calls for contacts in the next several months to those who have not yet responded. I might say that that correspondence does not cost ESTC anything. It is all done by the college office and I have to wait till I can sandwich it in between the other correspondence my secretary is getting out. So that explains, perhaps, the pattern of the letters. It will also explain the pattern of the follow-up calls. According to the list I have in my pocket, we have heard from 70 percent of this group.

We are also keeping in touch with contributors through our publication Facsimile. Beginning next year, we will do so through the pages of the British Library's Factotum, which will become a joint publication serving the international ESTC. Let me just point out in closing that Germany has started a project at Göttingen, under Professor Bernard Fabian of Muenster University, and that project will probably be extended to other German libraries. It goes beyond the ESTC. It is actually an early imprints project dealing with publications in all languages at Göttingen before 1800, and I suspect that Wolfenbüttel will contribute as will other libraries with large collections of that sort. The Italians have expressed interest and, indeed, ESTC is becoming a model for national early imprint catalogs for other countries. The French have now started to make inquiries. The Danish Royal Library has already contributed, and there are projects afoot in Australia and New Zealand. Of course, both in Canada and in the United States we already have, as I indicated, 150 libraries who have agreed to make contributions.

I am pleased to have this opportunity report on our progress and I am also pleased to tell you that the project is succeeding. We are doing what we said we would be able to do and it is always nice to be able to make that kind of a report. I hope that in future meetings with you as individuals and perhaps collectively that I can report still further progress and still more contributions by all the libraries represented in this room. Thank you.

MR. KREISSMAN (University of California, Davis): Some of us either personally or by campus activity have a particular interest in the eighteenth century and, foreseeing a mutually beneficial operation, I requested the newsletters of the British ESTC and your ESTC. I got very positive responses. I wonder whether you would consider including us all, at least on the North American ESTC newsletter?

DR. SNYDER: I will be happy to do so. We are going to combine our mailing lists with the British ESTC. Do you all want to receive the newsletters?

VOICES: Yes.

DR. SNYDER: You would all like personally to receive them. I am only thinking of the cost. You know, I try and keep the costs down and Margaret Child is over there watching me now, and I do not want to promise to spend too much that

deflects from our main purpose. But I will see that every library in this room is represented on the mailing list, either through the rare books librarian or director, if that is agreeable. If I do not have you on the list, I will put the director on the mailing list.

MR. McDONALD (University of Connecticut): Henry, this is probably in the literature you sent, but are official publications generated in the eighteenth century to be included?

DR. SNYDER: Yes, some official publications. By and large, they are. In fact, in fairly great detail. I think, for example, of the admiralty cases. In the British Library there was a single entry in the British Library catalog that said something like "admiralty cases, 1695 to 1827, 57 folio volumes." It turned out that there were somewhere between 200 and 400 cases in each volume, and each of those admiralty cases has been cataloged individually. You might be interested to know, too, that they do the research carefully. The question arose as to how admiralty cases are cataloged, so they went to admiralty lawyers and admiralty lawyers said, You do it by the name of the ship. In the ESTC those 10,000 to 20,000 cases are cataloged by the names of the ship.

MR. McDONALD: While I have the floor, Connie, I want to say that this gentleman, Henry Snyder, five years ago wrote to me when I was at ARL. He was in a state of alarm about how the subscription budgets of our libraries were making it impossible to buy books. He was ahead of his time and I think he must have been gratified by our discussion on the NPC and the straw vote that he observed here today.

DR. SNYDER: Thank you all very much.

PRESIDENT DUNLAP: Thank you. We are deeply grateful. May I ask Ralph McCoy to give the Executive Director's Report.

Report of the Interim Executive Director

MR. MCCOY: Some of you may remember the humorist Robert Benchley, who was frequently in a quandary. Benchley was once sent by his editor to cover an event in Venice. He sent back a cablegram that read: "Streets flooded; please advise."

Well, I arrived in Washington last January in something of a quandary to find a city populated with politicians, lobbyists, lawyers, bureaucrats, and a goodly number of other executive directors. Many of you have been very kind to advise. And I think we have had a reasonably good "interim year."

The year has not been very rewarding, however, in terms of national legislation, despite a great deal of effort expended both by ARL library directors and by the staff. You may recall that last October John Lorenz, in his report to the Membership, spoke of the 96th Congress as the "most frenetic" in his 24 years of experience in Washington. I can confirm that assessment.

We managed to save Title II-C of the Higher Education Act with the same appropriation as last year, but the regulations governing the award of the grants came in for considerable criticism both from Congress and from the library community. Opinions on what changes should be made were mixed, however, so as to make it difficult for the staff of the new Department of Education to evaluate the program at the end of this third year of operation. Legislation for a greatly improved and expanded government documents program was defeated, but largely for reasons not connected with the depository library system. The Artists Tax Equity bill, which would restore tax credits for gifts of manuscripts and works of art, credits that were removed by the Tax Reform Act of 1969, failed once again to move through Congress. There does not seem to be strong opposition to this change, but it is likely to come about only as a part of a comprehensive tax revision bill. But not this year.

The National Periodicals Center (NPC), which called forth the greatest legislative effort this year, ended with less than satisfactory results. The Act passed authorized the creation of a Corporation to conduct a study, but even this will not be funded this year. Without going into detail on the events that combined to defeat the NPC, let me indicate four contributing factors: 1) a lack of unanimity within the library community that was especially apparent to the congressional sponsors; 2) a vigorous campaign against the NPC waged by the information industry; 3) opposition from a number of scholarly societies and their members, particularly in the sciences, that felt that their journals were threatened by such a Center; 4) skepticism raised by the Arthur D. Little study conducted for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I should say, however, that ARL library directors, as well as the staff, worked very hard on behalf of the NPC legislation, as did our allies in the Association of American Universities. Incidentally, there were curious divisions within individual institutions: at one major university, the president and the legal counsel were actively supporting the NPC, while their university press director was actively opposing it.

Last month the ARL Committee on a National Periodicals System met in Washington to assess prospects for implementing present legislation and to explore alternative approaches that would advance the concept of a national periodical center. As Jim Schmidt reported, he will be presenting to the Board this evening that committee's recommendation for future action.

One of the most disturbing events of the congressional session was the cut-back in Library of Congress support, more than \$4 million, just at a time when the new James Madison Memorial Building needs additional staffing, and when so many programs affecting the nation's libraries are at stake. The budget-balancing mood of the Congress seems to preclude any restoration of funds this year.

Also affecting the Library of Congress, and of concern to all of us who value intellectual freedom, is the Conte amendment to the House appropriations for the legislative branch, which prohibits use of funds for the exchange of government publications with the Soviet Union, Cuba, and Iran. This measure would not only kill LC's long-standing exchange with the Lenin State Library, it would also pose a serious threat to freedom of international communication. If you have not yet received my letter calling for action, it should be on your desk when you return

home. [Note: the Conte amendment was removed from the continuing appropriations bill which the House approved on December 3.]

My letter also called attention to the recent Thor Power Tool decision of the U.S. Supreme Court which, as Jim Schmidt reported, will have a serious effect on the economics of book publishing. By denying tax credits for unsold books, the decision may result in reduced size of printings, higher prices on titles, limited availability of backlists, and in titles going out-of-print more rapidly. On the table we have placed copies of the New York Times article and a list of members of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. We urge you to write letters asking that this IRS decision be postponed.

Let me now turn to a brighter aspect of the year's activities. Without going into detail, since we report on most of these things in the ARL Newsletter, let me just tick off a few of the year's accomplishments, many of which have been the work of very active ARL committees and task forces.

One of the important achievements of the year, it seems to me, was the adoption at the Salt Lake City meeting of the statement of "Principles on Network Development and Research Libraries," which should prove a valuable guide to future network cooperation. Also at Salt Lake City, the Membership approved the new Interlibrary Loan Code, following months of study and review by ARL and ALA committees, and adopted new criteria for ARL membership, also the result of a year-long study by a task force.

The ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control has made considerable progress during the year, as indicated in the report of the chairman, and has laid out an ambitious agenda for the coming year. The Committee on ARL Statistics has reworked the salary survey, developed the index for membership criteria, and is formulating plans to provide ARL libraries with additional statistical data that should be useful in management decision making. You may be interested to know that the historical statistics of ARL libraries have been converted into machine-readable form and a printed compilation will be available soon. Special appreciation should go to two individuals who, although not ARL directors, have contributed many hours to these projects: Gordon Fretwell of the University of Massachusetts, and Kendon Stubbs of the University of Virginia.

You have heard the final report on the microform project carried out by Dick Boss with an ARL Advisory Committee. Copies of the report will be sent to all ARL directors as soon as the report can be reproduced. The ARL Board will be considering the recommendations in the report at their winter meeting. The Library Catalog Cost Model in which a number of ARL libraries participated has recently been published. It is a pioneering work and may very well pave the way both in substance and in technique for further research on library management costs. The attention given to the preparation of librarians in research libraries by the newly formed Task Force on Library Education, of course, has been the topic of this meeting, and we look forward to working with the Council on Library Resources on its long-range project for improving the education of academic and research librarians.

Since the work of the Office of Management Studies has already been reviewed by Duane Webster, let me just say that despite turnover in professional

staff this year, the OMS has done a remarkable job in carrying out its various programs in behalf of the improvement of academic library management. Formal programs this year have involved some 30 ARL libraries. This is in addition to the numerous informal consultations.

A long-range program for the reproduction of material of interest to Chinese scholarship has been formulated recently by the advisory committee to our Center for Chinese Research Materials. The plan takes into consideration the new relationships with the People's Republic of China, as well as changing needs of China scholars. The Center's publications continue to be in demand by the libraries with East Asian collections, both in this country and abroad, and I can report that the Center is in good financial condition. I am also pleased to report that P.K. Yu, the Director of the Center, who has been on medical leave since May, is greatly improved in health and will be returning to work next month. During his absence we were fortunate to have the consultation services of Eugene Wu of the Harvard-Yenching Library.

We continue to work closely with the Association of American Universities, our neighbor across Dupont Circle. In addition to joint legislative activities ARL has also provided an advisory committee to assist the AAU in updating the library chapter of its report on the "Future of the Research University." We are also working with the American Association for the Advancement of the Humanities in planning a small conference of librarians and scholars in an effort to improve understanding of research libraries.

At the recommendation of the ARL Board, arrangements have been made with the Canadian Association of Research Libraries for an exchange of publications and representation at meetings. We are working closely with the American Council of Learned Societies through regular meetings with editors of scholarly journals to explore issues of common interest, which was an outgrowth of the National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication, and we are having fruitful discussions with the Council on Library Resources on a number of promising projects.

ARL has established effective liaison with the Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue Project, as you have just heard, and we continue to have an excellent working relationship with the ALA Washington Office, with the new Department of Education (which has elevated the library agency in the hierarchy), and with the National Endowment for the Humanities.

And speaking of the National Endowment for the Humanities, I think this is an appropriate time to invite our good friends Margaret Child and Stephen Goodell to report on NEH news of interest to research libraries.

MS. CHILD: As you can see, I have called in a reinforcement. The parade of grants from NEH to either the Association for various projects or to individual libraries has become more than I can cope with alone, and so Steve is here to assume responsibility for our Challenge Grant Program; I know some of you are very interested in this program. This reflects a reallocation of responsibilities within the agency as a whole in that, whereas Challenge Grants used to come through the program units, Steve is now assuming full responsibility for pre-application consultation and review, as well as the administration of those grants. He is going

to talk to you about the changes in this program under the Endowment's authorization for the next four years.

I will, therefore, confine my remarks to what is happening in the Research Resources Program, the program in the Division of Research Programs which has the most to do with library-oriented projects. Research Resources has now been officially split into two parts. The core of it, what used to be called Research Collections, supports various kinds of projects to make basic research materials of interest to scholars in the humanities accessible for use. The workload in our area of responsibility has been increased because all the bibliographic projects have now been officially transferred to our jurisdiction. For example, Henry Snyder and the ESTC are now part of my responsibility rather than the Research Tools Program. We have had another deadline since that transfer and I suppose I should be enthralled by the fact that the number of applications we received increased from 100 to 185. If I look tired, that is one of the reasons.

Unfortunately, only \$700,000 was transferred to cover the bibliographic projects. It is much easier to get additional responsibility in the government, I find, than to get additional money, and so obviously there is going to be additional pressure on the program's funds, and the bibliographic projects will be in competition with the library cataloging projects and with the archival processing projects that had been our responsibility earlier. The increase in the workload has also caused us to move to an annual deadline. We now have a deadline on the first of June every year. It is not going to change again, I hope, and it will be, unfortunately, a very long review cycle because of the four-level evaluation each proposal must go through. So, if you apply against that June 1 deadline, do not expect to hear from us until early the following March.

Another change in the program has been that the Conservation and Preservation Program is now a separate budget line, still within Research Resources but separately funded. Getting any kind of new budget line through the administration of the agency, through the Office of Management and Budget and, we hope, through Congress (though we are on a continuing resolution at the moment), is something of an accomplishment. We now have a program at NEH officially titled Conservation and Preservation, aimed at the whole area of research materials that are going to be of extreme importance for humanistic scholars.

As many of you are aware, we have made a number of experimental grants in the preservation area over the last two years as we were developing the program. We have 13 proposals in this cycle. A panel will be meeting next week, as a matter of fact, and I hope will devote a large part of its time to a discussion of how we can best use the rather limited amount of money which has been allocated to the program this year — only a half million dollars — to get some programs started which will, potentially, make an impact on this overwhelming problem. Because of the very small amount of funding available, the focus is on collaborative, very definitely "seed money" projects. We are concentrating on three areas.

First, training. Both in the past and probably again in this cycle, we will make grants for training, from very basic workshops to instruct curatorial people in what not to do — how not to destroy the materials in their custody — to much more ambitious projects. For example, there is one proposal at the moment to start a program to train professional conservators in book and paper conservation in this

country, the first such program, if it manages to find funding. We are very interested in this kind of proposal, because, as those of you who have tried to hire staff for a conservation program are well aware, there just are not trained people in this field.

The second area of concentration is planning for disaster preparedness through various kinds of regional services. There is at the moment only one regional conservation center focused on paper in the country and we are trying to get a little movement other places.

The third area is research. The research component is one that we put into the program originally and is extremely important because a great deal still remains to be learned about conservation methods and technologies. But I will confess it is a very difficult kind of application for the staff at the National Endowment for the Humanities to evaluate. I am currently trying to find some way of collaborating with the National Science Foundation because humanists are not very good, I have discovered, at looking at reviews of pure science-related applications and deciding whether or not they should be funded. We have a couple more of those proposals and we will see how they fare this cycle. I encourage submission of proposals in this area. Also, if anybody has any helpful ideas about how we could smooth the evaluation process, I would be delighted to hear them.

Now I will let Steve tell you about all the exciting things that are going on in Challenge Grants.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you. I am happy to be here for the first time addressing this group. I will try to keep my remarks brief.

One of the things I have learned in working for a federal agency that has now converted its mailing lists to the computer system is that you can never rely on it. We developed a one-page flyer several weeks ago to announce the next deadline and schedule that applicants should follow, and I assume there is an excellent chance that none of you have received it. So I brought about 50 copies or so which I will leave on the table on my way out and I will linger somewhat after the session to speak to anybody who has any specific questions about these grants.

The Challenge Grant Program is probably familiar to most of you. I recognize some faces as either grantees or people who have sat on our panels. Margaret mentioned that we are centralizing the program. I will explain why we are doing that by citing the dimensions of the program statistically.

The Challenge Grant Program was begun in 1976. It was authorized by the Congress and we have had four years of experience with the following levels of appropriations. In fiscal year 1977 the Endowment was given \$9 million for Challenge Grants to institutions. The following year the Endowment received 17.5 million, 27 million dollars in 1979, and 27 million dollars in 1980. So in four years the Endowment has had \$80.5 million worth of federal funds for these grants.

We have had five cycles of applications in less than three and a half calendar years to cover those four federal fiscal years, and in those five cycles we have received 1,134 applications. This spans the range of all humanities institutions, including research libraries, centers for advanced academic or scholarly study,

museums, historical societies, and the like. Of those 1,134 applications, we have funded 585, a little over 51%. The requested funding from NEH from those 1,134 institutions exceeded \$383 million. This is in multi-year funds, as against that \$80.5 million spread over a period of several years. The Endowment, in that 51% funding ratio, has been able to honor those 585 awards to the extent of \$134 million. It is a large program for NEH, which in Washington is nickels and dimes, as we all know.

We are before the Congress now with two reauthorization bills — we are on a continuing resolution both for appropriations as well as for our existence. The money figure for Challenge Grants has dropped from our \$27 million plateau for the last two years to \$24 million. We also are before the Office of Management and Budget with a high Challenge Grant request of \$30 million. We would like to recover the \$3 million that we lost in fiscal '81, but I do not know what the reaction will be to that request.

The Challenge Grant Program, as you know, is an institutional support program, the only program of its type in the Endowment. It can support the basic or general operations of institutions, such as research libraries. It may fund such things as endowment. It can support acquisitions budgets. It can pay salaries. It can establish development endowments. It can cover the span of operational needs that are determined by the institution itself.

In the past the Endowment has had a policy which restricted or limited grants to no more than one to an institution. This past spring we met twice with our National Council on the Humanities and a special committee set up to deal with the policies and procedures of the Challenge Grant Program, and the Endowment has altered or changed that policy so that we now will allow repeat grants in three categories. We will receive applications from institutions already in receipt of challenge grants, if they are research libraries, institutions that have conservation capabilities or conservation needs, or free-standing centers for advanced scholarly study in the humanities. I should acknowledge that I appreciate very much, by the way, the help that ARL staff gave to the Endowment staff in developing the draft language establishing the new rules which will govern operation of these second grants.

The amounts which will be available in these three categories will be \$750,000 over three years for research libraries to cover their general needs and expenditures as determined by them, \$150,000 spread over three years for the pure conservation grants, and a \$750,000 maximum for the centers for advanced academic study. Our next deadline is May 1, 1981. We ask institutions to notify us by mid-March with a letter of intent to give staff a sense of what the workload will be.

The Challenge Grant Program is a three-year program in the sense that it makes federal monies available on a 3 to 1 matching basis to institutions spread over three federal fiscal years. In point of fact, institutions are given approximately five calendar years to raise the 3 to 1 matching money which is required by the law. This means that we give institutions, in fact, one full year of advanced fund raising. So as of two weeks ago, institutions that are contemplating applying against that May 1, 1981 deadline could have begun raising money in anticipation of a successful challenge award or application.

We are taking the May applications to a November 1981 Council, which puts awards a couple of months into the federal fiscal year. The most compelling reason

we are doing that is because in the past we have acted before the Congress has acted on our appropriations for the first year's worth of offers in these multi-year grants. We are now sitting on 122 favorable recommendations until our appropriations are settled. This has been the practice, unfortunately, of the past. We hope that by going to the Council in November we need not repeat this.

We have identified, incidentally, 56 institutions that have received Challenge Grants that are in fact institutions which house members of the ARL. Most of the Independent Research Library Association membership have also received challenge grants. Before I came to this meeting, I ran through the list very quickly and I note that 16 of you are eligible to apply for second time grants in this first round. (An institution's first challenge grant must have run out before we allow the institution to come back for a second time.)

Our revised guidelines are maybe the 19th draft version that I have gone through. Somebody mentioned the thickness of their lenses. It is only because you have the proper prescription; I am in line for that myself. These draft guidelines will be ready for publication and distribution by mid to late-November. If you wish for a copy and are not on the mailing list, please give me a call. My telephone number is (202) 724-0267 or, by all means, please write to me at the Challenge Grant Program, NEH, Mail Stop 800. Thank you very much.

MR. McCOY: Thank you, Margaret and Steve. At this time we usually call upon Dick Hays for a report from the Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies of the Department of Education, but Dick, who has been with us earlier, has just been called to the Office of the Secretary. I hope it is good news. Ray Fry and Frank Stevens are with us this afternoon and available for any of you who have questions on library programs.

Now I would like to call on Lee Jones of the Council on Library Resources to report on the Bibliographic Services Development Program (BSDP).

MR. JONES: I promise not to take very long. You have had detailed reports in the past and I just want to briefly mention the activities we have been involved in over the last six months.

I have told you in the past of our interest in standards, both bibliographic and technical, and that interest continues to this day. We now have draft position papers in hand on standards for institution identification codes and detailed holding statements and bibliographic records. We are about to contract with a consultant to produce an application level protocol for the communication of bibliographic records between two different computer systems.

In the area of linking bibliographic data bases, the Battelle Study has been completed and the report delivered to the Council. We have finished cleaning up some editorial problems in the report and are now fishing for a reasonably priced printer. That report should be available within a month or six weeks and I would be happy to have requests for that report from any of you. There will be a charge for it, based on the cost to produce and distribute the document; \$10 or so is the probable figure.

The report concludes that linking has clear validity and recommends a particular way to link the bibliographic utilities. Since not all possible links were

examined but a computer model was produced to examine other linking alternatives, a second recommendation out of that document is that the model itself be used to explore other linking options. The model will be available for use by researchers in the field — those interested in networking, both in the utilities and the regional networks, scholars in library schools — who may be interested in manipulating the model. A detailed user's guide will be prepared.

I would simply point out that our activity in the area of name authority structures continues. The Name Authority File Service Task Force has completed its review of the national level authority record and forwarded it to the Library of Congress for consideration. A specific requirements document, that is, detailed requirements on what a nationwide authority file service ought to be like and how it ought to function, is now in preparation and will be available for review before the next time you meet. We have published a concept paper in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin and requested comments on that document. If you have not seen it, we hope that you will take the opportunity to look it up, review it, and submit comments to us.

The other principal area of activity in the course of the last six months has been on-line public access catalogs. We awarded a grant to a joint proposal from OCLC and RLG to assess the current state of the art of on-line public access catalogs. That project has been completed, the report has been submitted, and we are seeking a printer for it. The report will also be available in approximately a month to six weeks. This report assesses what is going on in the United States in on-line public access catalogs. It summarizes a two-day discussion at the Dartmouth-Menari Conference Center of some 26 individuals representing operating on-line public access catalogs or institutions well along the way to designing such instruments, and identifies the issues that need continued investigation and recommends priorities for action. We already have some proposals in hand to address those particular recommendations.

Finally, I would say that the most recent quarterly report of BSDP is just about ready for distribution. If any of you would like a copy, I would be happy to supply it to you. Are there any questions? Thank you.

MR. McCOY: Thank you, Lee.

Let me conclude my remarks by expressing gratitude to the Association for the privilege of serving you this year as Interim Executive Director. It has been a pleasure to work with all of you, to renew old acquaintances, and to make new friends in the Association. My thanks to the ARL Board, to President Connie Dunlap and the other officers, and especially to the wonderful supporting staff of ARL. Thank you.

Report of the ARL President

MS. DUNALP: I had occasion recently to describe what ARL is and what it does and to recount some of the Association's major accomplishments to a foreign visitor. It was such an impressive list that I would like to share at least some of the most recent activities with you. We have spent considerable time and energy dealing

with the major issues confronting academic libraries, but we have also addressed alike concern for the education, training, and development of the research library professionals and for communication and interaction with the scholarly community. In this last regard, Ralph McCoy has been especially effective in enhancing our relationships with scholarly and educational organizations. He serves on the Committee of Scholarly Communication established by the American Council of Learned Societies to consider issues raised in the Report of the National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication. Five of our colleagues serve as an advisory committee to the Association of American Universities to assist in identifying problems and recommending solutions to be included in AAU's The Future of the Research University. The program at last fall's meeting, as well as this one, was devoted to scholarly communication and to education. At the February 1980 Board Meeting a Task Force on Library Education was established. Margot McBurney, who chairs this task force, also serves as liaison to the Advisory Committee of the Council on Library Resources Program in Professional Education and Training for Research Librarianship (PETREL).

On the nuts and bolts side of the ledger, ARL commissioned two major studies: the Library Catalog Cost Model and the Bibliographic Control of Materials in Microform. OMS, in addition to its numerous ongoing programs, has begun a Consultants Training Program and is working on a Preservation Project, similar in application to the Collection Analysis Program. OMS will also be developing a Public Services Study Program. As another means of communication and exchange, invitations have been extended to the Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL) to have its President attend our meetings and the ARL Executive Director attend the CARL meetings. In fact, Ralph McCoy is going to attend the CARL meeting in New Brunswick on November 4-5, 1980. Committees and task forces have also dealt with CONSER, networking, bibliographic control, and a host of other important issues. This is only a very superficial listing. I have tried not to overlap Ralph too much, but I hope it does indicate at least the scope of the involvement in issues of vital concern to research librarianship. I think the Association has every right to be very proud of its accomplishments.

Over the summer, the Executive Committee considered ways ARL should focus its energies and attention in the future. Ideas and concerns to provide the leadership for and the visibility of ARL were divided into five major categories as follows:

1. ARL as the national forum for research libraries in the United States and Canada.
2. ARL as the national advocate for research libraries in the U.S. and Canada.
3. ARL as the national liaison between research libraries in the U.S. and Canada and the world of corporate, educational, learned, and library organizations and foundations.
4. ARL as the national liaison between research libraries in the U.S. and Canada and the respective federal governments.

5. ARL as the national secretariat providing guidance and assistance in identifying, analyzing, and solving research library problems in such areas as management, personnel, professional education, collection development, bibliographic control, shared resources, and preservation and conservation.

The Board was in agreement with the principles advanced and a detailed report will be presented to you at the meeting next May.

One piece of business which I suspect may not be met with exactly overwhelming enthusiasm is the need for a modest dues increase. Inflation has affected all of us and the impact has been no less on the Association. Full information will be provided in writing and an official ballot will be mailed to each of you shortly.

It is my pleasure to announce to you now the results of yesterday's ballot by the Board: Penny Abell was elected Vice President/President-Elect, and Irene Hoadley was elected Executive Committee Member-at-Large. Since I will not be serving as Past President, it was felt important to have a third Board Member on the Executive Committee.

I should like to pay a very special tribute to Ralph McCoy. He has served the Association so admirably and he really deserves our deepest heartfelt thanks. Please join me in expressing our appreciation. (Standing ovation.) Although all of you are aware of the competence and dedication of the ARL staff, I rather suspect that only an officer can fully appreciate how truly exceptional they are. Let's give them a rousing cheer.

Three members of the Board will finish their terms at the end of this meeting. They are Lee Anderson, Dick Dougherty, and Frank Grisham. In addition to my personal thanks, may I express the gratitude of the Board for their wisdom and for their insight. Each has made a significant contribution to the Association. Gentlemen, take a bow.

The time has come — and if anybody finishes that, I'll kill 'em — for me to turn the office of the presidency over to my very able successor, Jay Lucker. I must say I do this with just a little bit of reluctance, partly because it has been a wonderful experience but mostly because it signals the end of my association with a wonderful group of people. You have been a joy and an inspiration. I have really enjoyed knowing you and working with you. I shall truly miss you. Bless you all.

MR. LUCKER: I am sure you will all join with me in expressing our deep appreciation to Connie for all that she has done for ARL, not just for this year but over the years. I know that I will personally miss her on the Board and I have considered it a great pleasure to work with her for these years.

You will also be pleased to know that there is no tradition of a presidential inauguration speech at this organization. I would just like to say that I consider it an honor and a privilege to serve the Association and I am looking forward to working with all of you next year. I expect and need your help. I will call upon you without advance notice for advice and assistance. I hope you will communicate with me your concerns, your interests, your willingness to participate. We are looking

forward to another banner year. It is a tough act to follow, Connie, but we will do the best we can.

If there is no further business, I declare the 97th Meeting of the Association adjourned.

APPENDIX - A

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARL STATISTICS 1979-80

The committee is engaged in four activities:

- a. historical statistics
- b. current statistics
- c. factor analysis of current statistics for membership purposes
- d. salary statistics

The ARL historical statistics have been compiled in computer readable form by Kendon Stubbs of the University of Virginia, and should be available for distribution in the fall. The ARL office will sell copies to interested researchers, especially library school students, who may be able to perform studies of value. Explanatory materials and advertising are also being prepared. It is hoped to add to this file year by year as new data are produced.

Mr. Stubbs has also consented to continue to perform the factor analysis of current statistics which the ARL office will use in answering membership inquiries. In addition, he is completing a more detailed explanation than we now possess of the factor analysis which is to be used for membership purposes. This will be available for distribution to ARL libraries in the fall.

Salary statistics this year are being compiled by Gordon Fretwell at the University of Massachusetts. He has re-designed the current salary data input form to ease the collection of data at member libraries by eliminating local calculations. These calculations will now be done by computer, and the existing computer programs have been modified to accomplish this. There will also be some modest changes in the display of the data received, chiefly to provide more information about the salaries of minorities.

The current statistics are being compiled by the ARL office. No significant changes are being planned for the year. However, the committee members realize that this data has limited management utility, and we intend to consider this year whether we should make any recommendations to the Board about collecting such data. To help us with the decision, we may issue a brief supplementary questionnaire.

Kendon Stubbs
Anne Woodsworth
Richard J. Talbot, Chair

August 12, 1980

APPENDIX - B

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARL COMMITTEE ON A NATIONAL PERIODICALS SYSTEM 1979-80

A. Summary of year's activity

The committee's efforts to effect the establishment with Federal funding of a National Periodical Center (NPC) intensified during the past year with the introduction of authorizing legislation in September 1979 (H.R. 5192). This legislation was introduced as a new Part D of Title II of the Higher Education Act reauthorization (P.L. 96-374 as amended) and was passed by the House without hearings. In its testimony submitted to the House early in October 1979 in support of Parts A, B, and C of Title II, ARL included supportive materials on the new Part D.

When the legislation passed from the House to the Senate (S. 1839), ARL, in cooperation with the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Center for Research Libraries (CRL), held briefings on the legislation on January 28 for scholarly and scientific societies, and on January 29 for the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and the Humanities.

The committee maintained close contact with the ARL Office as the legislation was revised by and progressed through the Senate, as well as during the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. The committee met in Salt Lake City on May 14 to discuss strategy and tactics for the House/Senate conference committee on HEA, and to establish a network of legislation contacts between ARL directors and conferees.

The committee met on September 16 with representatives of the Council on Library Resources, CRL, and AAU to critique legislative strategy and results, and to consider next steps. The committee met again on October 16, and presented its recommendations to the ARL Board later that evening.

B. Current status of legislation

The Education Amendments of 1980, which reauthorize and extend the Higher Education Act for five more years, were passed by the House in September 1979 (H.R. 5192) and by the Senate (S. 1839) in June 1980. A conference committee met in July 1980 to reconcile differences, and its report was approved by the House in August but rejected by the Senate in September. A second conference committee met on September 16, and its report was approved by the House on September 18, and by the Senate on September 25. The bill was signed into law by President Carter on October 3, 1980. A new Part D has been added to Title II which authorizes \$750,000 per year for two years and the appointment of the President of a National Periodicals System (NPS) Corporation to investigate the "advisability and

feasibility" of NPS, and to develop and propose to Congress for its approval an operating plan for the same. However, before funds for Part D can be appropriated, funding for Parts A, B, and C must be at the FY79 levels, an unlikely prospect.

C. Critique of legislative strategy

1. Overall, our greatest vulnerability was lack of wholehearted support in some sectors of the library community, e.g., public libraries. The soft spots were exploited by the Information Industry Association (IIA) and other NPC opponents as well as by some nominal NPC supporters.
2. The Congressional committees sought and failed to get an unambiguous signal of support for NPC from the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. It seemed unlikely, although possible, that such support could have been forthcoming — and efforts were made to get it — but such support was not to be, given the nature of the Conference and its delegates.
3. The IIA was able to exploit effectively the fears of scholarly journals of small circulation of the effect of an NPC, e.g., James Banner's speech to the October 1979 ARL Meeting (The Future of Scholarly Communication: Minutes of the Ninety-Fifth Meeting, p. 28-32) an article in Humanities Report (August 1980, p. 4-8).
4. Some parties felt that the introduction of legislation in the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education in September was precipitous and unilateral. Others feel and felt that had that not occurred, the library community would still be talking with the prospect of legislation no closer.
5. The A. D. Little study sponsored by NCLIS reinforced doubts about the technological feasibility and/or possible obsolescence of an NPC. One plausible interpretation of the A. D. Little study could be that it was an attempt by its sponsor to regain the initiative on NPC.
6. NPC was damaged by political trade-offs on other issues and parts of the Higher Education Act.
7. We were unable to present unequivocal evidence to the conference committee that the trigger mechanism was not needed given the Senate version which called for yet another study.

D. Recommendations for further action

1. That ARL, working with the American Council on Education (ACE) and other appropriate organizations, make recommendations to the Department of Education, if it prepares and publishes regulations for Title II-D.

2. That ARL continue to support full appropriations for Parts A, B, and C, and be alert to opportunities to fund Part D.
3. That ARL discharge the existing committee and create a joint committee with CRL to develop a plan and secure funding to establish a national periodical lending service at the Center.
4. That ARL re-establish a Federal relations committee and set up a legislative network.

Richard De Gennaro
John McDonald
Peter Paulson, N.Y. State Library
Allen Veaner
C. James Schmidt, Chair

October 16, 1980

APPENDIX - C

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARL COMMITTEE ON INTERLIBRARY LOAN 1979-80

During 1979-80, the ARL Committee on Interlibrary Loan continued to work with the American Library Association Reference and Adult Services Division (ALA/RASD) Interlibrary Loan Committee on the final version of the revised "National Interlibrary Loan Code." Following the ALA Midwinter Meeting in January 1980, a final draft was issued which contained a number of changes from the version that had been discussed at the October 1979 ARL meeting. The two principal differences were the elimination of a statement in the introduction defining interlibrary loan as a privilege; the second was the removal of an item in Section IV, "Responsibility of Borrowing Libraries," stating that the status of the individual for whom the material is being requested should be included if required by lending library. By means of a conference call in early May and a subsequent meeting of the Committee during the ARL meeting in Salt Lake City, it was agreed to recommend to the ARL Board of Directors that the revised code be ratified. This action by the Board was taken. The committee will continue to be represented by its chairman on the ALA/RASD Interlibrary Loan Committee which now plans to direct attention toward revising the Interlibrary Loan Procedures Manual.

The committee also devoted considerable time to matters related to hearings on Section 108 of the Copyright Law. After much discussion it was decided that the ARL Committee on Interlibrary Loans should not give testimony at hearings sponsored by the Copyright Office. The reasons for this decision are as follows.

1. Testimony given on behalf of libraries at both the Chicago and Houston hearings did not reveal any unusual problems for most libraries, aside from the time involved and the nuisance of keeping records to comply with the "rule of five copies."
2. ARL has not gathered information from its members concerning adverse affects of Section 108, and thus there is little evidence on which to submit testimony.
3. Since representatives of the publishing industry are questioning the provisions of Section 108, the burden of proving damage rests with them rather than the library community.
4. Because the arguments on behalf of the publishing industry are not yet clearly spelled out, testimony by ARL at this time may be premature and could conceivably lead to negative affects in future reviews.
5. ARL libraries are basically lending rather than borrowing libraries, and the most serious affects of Section 108 would be felt by borrowers — which would be best represented by ALA, the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Special Libraries Association, etc., which have broader constituencies.

The committee believes it is the responsibility of the Copyright Office to make the official study of the affects of the Copyright Law. The committee stands ready to cooperate with ALA in any studies of the law's affect upon libraries, but it is not clear at this time whether ALA will proceed with such a study. The committee will continue to keep informed about developments in this area and will review the matter at subsequent meetings.

The committee was ably served by Jay K. Lucker as chairman until last spring when, because of his increased responsibilities as an officer of the Association, Mr. Lucker resigned his membership on the committee. Sterling J. Albrecht was subsequently appointed to succeed Mr. Lucker on the committee and Kenneth G. Peterson was appointed chairman.

Sterling J. Albrecht (incoming)
H. Gordon Bechanan
Jay K. Lucker (outgoing)
Susan K. Martin
Glenora Rossell
Kenneth G. Peterson, Chair

September 2, 1980

APPENDIX - D

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARL TASK FORCE ON BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL 1979-80

The ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control has been consulted on a number of issues relevant to national standards and practices in the area of bibliographic control. Among these were the Library of Congress' priorities in cataloging; national level authority records and contributions to the authority file; the National Level of Bibliographic Records — Books; and the Independent Research Libraries Association's standards for rare book and manuscript cataloging. The task force members reviewed the report on the cost model for adapting local library catalogs to AACR 2 prepared by King Research, and the chairman reviewed the final draft prior to publication. The task force has had several general discussions on the CONSER project and its importance to research libraries. In an effort to alert ARL directors to the importance of CONSER, two members, Susan Brynteson and Joseph Howard, prepared papers on the subject, and an effort is now underway to merge them into one statement that might be disseminated to ARL's membership.* During the year, the task force has maintained liaison with the ARL Bibliographic Control of Materials in Microform Project, the Bibliographic Services Development Program of the Council on Library Resources, the Network Advisory Committee of the Library of Congress, and the ARL Task Force on National Library Network Development.

The task force held four meetings during the year. In the discussions, a growing concern emerged over the policy decisions required and being made during this period of transition in national cataloging, and the need for greater involvement of management in those decisions because of their financial and organizational implications. If it is continued beyond this current year, the task force would hope to address that problem in an effective manner.

One of the group's goals for the year was to assist ARL libraries in the transition to AACR 2. To that end, studies within specific libraries and other relevant documentation have been gathered and will soon be available in a SPEC Kit. Further methods of providing assistance in this connection, as well as the matter described in the paragraph above, combined with its past role of providing liaison for ARL with major agencies of bibliographic control, would occupy the task force in the upcoming year if it is reappointed. During the year, Susan Brynteson resigned when she became director of a non-ARL library, and Joseph Rosenthal succeeded her on the task force.

Merle N. Boylan
Joseph H. Howard
Ake Koel
Joseph Rosenthal
James F. Govan, Chair

September 1980

*The "Report on the CONSER Project" was endorsed by the Membership on October 16, 1980, and appears on p. 78.

APPENDIX - E

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARL TASK FORCE ON NATIONAL LIBRARY NETWORK DEVELOPMENT 1979-80

The task force has been charged to maintain working liaison with groups currently active in the development of a national bibliographic network, to identify issues of particular concern to ARL libraries, and to recommend to the Board appropriate actions. During the past year, the task force drafted a statement which set forth a number of principles intended to facilitate better relations between the national bibliographic utilities and ARL libraries. The statement of principles as passed by the Membership at the Salt Lake City ARL Meeting (May 1980) is intended to assist members in their dealings with the bibliographic utilities.

The issues of network development are currently in flux. For example, in recent months, some regional networks seem to be assuming more important roles. The fluidity of the situation prompts the task force to recommend that the document be periodically reviewed by the Association.

Throughout its existence the task force has served as a sounding board. It has identified several concerns that led to Board appointments of task forces charged to undertake specific projects. The "centers of excellence" or "centers of responsibility" concept emanated from the task force and gave rise to the appointment of the Association's Task Force on Bibliographic Control. Concerns about cooperative cataloging of microforms led to the Microform Project currently funded by NEH. The task force is now of the opinion that the Association should address the very complex issue of resource sharing.

The more general availability of bibliographic information will quickly lead to greater demands for resource sharing through document delivery. While most ARL libraries support the concept of expanded document delivery programs, stable and/or declining budgets may make it increasingly difficult for some member libraries to accommodate unlimited or uncontrolled expansion. The recent effort to establish a National Periodicals Center has been one attempt to expand resource sharing. Even if a periodicals center is established, it will not replace the need to share resources among individual ARL libraries. The resources possessed by member libraries cannot be wholly duplicated by any lending agency.

ARL libraries may wish to develop models for viable resource sharing programs. But numerous operational, economic, and political issues must be resolved first. For example, patterns of demand and supply should be monitored to prevent serious lending and borrowing imbalances. The current existence of such imbalances may have caused some libraries to introduce lending fees. Fees are only one of the issues identified. It is the task force's recommendation to the Board that this task force or a new one be charged to draft a position paper on the implications of network development and expanded bibliographical control as it impacts resource sharing among member libraries.

Patricia M. Battin
William J. Studer
William J. Welsh
Richard M. Dougherty, Chair

September 16, 1980

APPENDIX - F

Report on the CONSER Project

Background¹

The CONSER (Conversion of Serials) Project is a cooperative effort by the library community to build a machine-readable data base of quality bibliographic and cataloging information for serials that conforms to national standards. Originally envisioned as a foundation for union listing activities, CONSER information can also be used in interlibrary loan, ordering, cataloging, check-in and other serials processing operations, and as a basis for bibliographies.

The objectives of the CONSER Project, as stated by the participants in 1979, are:

1. To provide a reliable and authoritative serials data base to meet the needs of library patrons, other users of information, and the developing national and international bibliographic networks.
2. To assist the national libraries of both Canada and the United States in the establishment and maintenance of a machine-readable serials data base.
3. To support the interface of national serials data base activities with the programs of international serials systems — including the participation of the National Serials Data Program (NSDP) and ISDS/Canada in the International Serials Data System (ISDS).
4. To support local, regional, national, and international serial union list activities.
5. To ensure the use of nationally and internationally accepted standards, rules, and conventions for building and maintaining serials bibliographic records.
6. To identify deficiencies in the data base, such as subject, language, and retrospective coverage, and to implement appropriate remedies.

The CONSER Project was initiated by the Ad Hoc Discussion Group on Serials Data Bases. The Group resulted from an informal meeting at the American Library Association Conference in Las Vegas in June 1973 of librarians concerned about the confusion and duplication of effort related to the creation of machine readable serials data bases. The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) expressed interest in the discussions and encouraged the Discussion Group to seek solutions to these problems. ARL and the Library of Congress (LC) jointly asked the Council on Library Resources (CLR) to sponsor the CONSER Project, with LC and the National Library of Canada (NLC) to serve as centers of authentication. The Council negotiated a contract on behalf of the Project for OCLC, Inc. to serve as the host utility and resource data base for creating and maintaining machine-readable serials information. Contracts were signed in 1974 and participants began to contribute information in the fall of 1975.

The Council on Library Resources provided management support throughout the term of the contract, including establishing the advisory group and providing financial support for such things as terminals and communication costs to participants, storage costs, and advisory group and participant meetings. When the original contract expired in November 1977, OCLC agreed to continue sponsorship and support of CONSER and assumed managerial responsibility as well. (The original plan was for LC was to take over operational responsibility for the Project, but the Library was unable to do so.) CLR continues to participate in the CONSER Advisory Group and in the CONSER participant meetings.

CONSER membership has grown from 10 participants in 1975 to 18 in 1980. A list of participants and the criteria for membership appear in the Appendix (p. 85).

How CONSER Works

When the Project began, there were few serial records in the OCLC data base. CLR examined several large machine-readable serials files, and provided a copy of the Minnesota Union List Serials (MULS) for OCLC to batch-load into its data base to serve, along with existing LC and NLC MARC serial records, as the basis for the Project's initial work. Later Pittsburgh Regional Library Center (PRLC) records were also batch-loaded into the system, though not as part of the CONSER Project. Each participating institution was assigned a portion of the alphabet to concentrate on first for entering its current serials. As work in these areas is completed, participants are converting the remainder of the institution's current serial holdings.

In addition to contributing new titles cataloged, the Library of Congress and the National Library of Canada serve as Centers of Responsibility for the CONSER Project, with responsibility for the quality of the bibliographic data, that is, certifying the correctness and completeness of the bibliographic information input by CONSER participating libraries. NLC is responsible for Canadian serial titles and LC for the remainder. Key title and ISSN are authenticated by ISDS/Canada for Canadian titles, and NSDP for U.S. titles. Weekly tapes of authenticated records are sent to LC and NLC for distribution through their MARC services.

In the authentication process, the OCLC control number and a "surrogate" are sent to the appropriate Center of Responsibility to document the new or upgraded CONSER record that appears in the data base. The surrogate is usually a photocopy of the cover, masthead, or title page of a serial, and any other documentation needed to support the cataloging. Authentication for bibliographic data is in accordance with the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules and the CONSER guidelines.

Several kinds of serial records appear in the OCLC data base: 1) base records from MULS or other union lists, not yet updated by a CONSER participant or authenticated by LC or NLC (OCLC Level K or L); 2) incomplete records input by any OCLC user, not yet updated by a CONSER participant or authenticated by LC or NLC (OCLC Level L); 3) OCLC Level I records input by users that are not CONSER participants; 4) records input or updated by a CONSER participant according to CONSER standards but not yet authenticated by LC or NLC (OCLC Level I); 5) authenticated records, checked for completeness and correctness by LC or NLC.

CONSER participants are able to upgrade records in the OCLC data base, including those previously upgraded by another CONSER participant if there is substantial reason (such as adding closing dates if the publication ceases or adding MESH subject headings). However, once the record is authenticated by either LC or NLC, it is "locked" and CONSER participants must notify LC of such changes rather than revising the data base directly.

In January 1980, in order to make the complete CONSER serials data base available to anyone who desires to purchase it, the Library of Congress made available a "snapshot", or magnetic tape copy, of all serial records in the CONSER data base at OCLC as of December 1979. No processing was performed by the Library of Congress prior to distribution of the snapshot file and, consequently, there are some differences between the CONSER snapshot file and the usual MARC Serials Distribution Service tapes. Local data fields are not carried in the snapshot file, nor were institutional location symbols present on the records.

Issues to be Resolved

The CONSER Project continues to be a dynamic and changing project with new information added daily to the CONSER data base. Attention has been focused on the Project with considerable acclaim for its success as a cooperative effort. However, several major issues are facing the CONSER project which must be resolved to enable it to meet its objectives.

1. Making the CONSER data base accessible online to all libraries. Under the current system, only OCLC participants have direct access to the CONSER data files. Non-OCLC users must now wait until either LC or NLC has authenticated a record and distributed it through the MARC tapes or use the CONSER snapshot file. Additionally, several CONSER participants are now or will soon be RLIN users, and are thus unable to contribute records to the Project.

Linking the bibliographic utilities would enable libraries of either system to have direct access to the CONSER data base. In the past few years, work has been done in linking by the National Technical Architecture Group and the Bibliographic Services Development Program. At its Membership Meeting in May 1980, the Association of Research Libraries endorsed the concept of linking the bibliographic utilities. The Technical Services Director of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group of ALA/RTSD also endorsed linking at its meeting in June 1980.

Because there are technical difficulties which must be overcome before linking can be achieved, several interim measures might be feasible. These measures might include:

- a. Transferring tapes of records from RLIN users to OCLC for CONSER use.
- b. Developing and maintaining CONSER as a split file using both RLIN and OCLC.

- c. Continuing to use OCLC for the CONSER Project, with RLIN users cataloging their serials on OCLC, and providing frequent update tapes to RLIN.

2. Accelerating the authentication process. One of the most serious problems facing CONSER participants and other users of CONSER records is the rate of authentication of CONSER records and the growing backlog at LC of records awaiting authentication.

By April 1980, the CONSER data base contained 250,000 titles, including over 90,000 titles (only slightly more than one third) authenticated by either the Library of Congress or the National Library of Canada. The CONSER authentication process presently has an arrearage of approximately 40,000 titles, and this arrearage is growing daily. Delay in the authentication process has brought national concern. On November 12-13, 1979, a meeting of representatives of CONSER participants and others, sponsored jointly by the Council on Library Resources and the U.S. Office of Education, was held in Washington, D.C. The approximately forty attendees at the meeting developed recommendations for action to be taken in the course of developing a national serials data base. One of the recommendations called for increased support of the authentication process at the Library of Congress to allow for the rapid validation and distribution of authenticated records. Indeed, as the number of CONSER participating libraries increases, the number of surrogates sent to the Centers of Responsibility for authentication will also increase.

In view of the concern with the rate of authentication, the Library of Congress and the National Library of Canada plan to present several proposals to CONSER participants at their October 23-24, 1980 meeting concerning levels of participation and responsibilities of participants. These include:

- a. The original CONSER concept was decentralized input by participating institutions, with centralized authentication by the two national cataloging agencies. This concept should be re-evaluated and modified to allow for the delegation of authentication responsibilities — primarily name authority work, but possibly responsibility for the full bibliographic record as well — to qualified CONSER participants. Several factors make the decentralization of the authentication process feasible: 1) LC's machine-readable name authority records are now available for searching on OCLC; 2) the level of cataloging input by CONSER members is of high quality; 3) LC's cooperative name authority program with several major research libraries, in which these libraries provide a full authority record without verification by LC, has been very successful.

The two national cataloging agencies would be responsible for determining if and when specific conditions warrant the delegation of some of their respective authentication functions to other institutions (for example, participation of a library in both CONSER and LC's cooperative name authority program). Authentication responsibilities could be delegated on the basis of a given participant's demonstrated resources and expertise in cataloging certain types of material (e.g., newspapers, government documents, etc.), certain subject specialities (e.g., medicine, Latin American studies, Slavic studies, etc.) or any other well-defined categories.

b. The following categories of CONSER membership are proposed:

- 1) Centers of Responsibility - Institutions responsible for the review, verification, and authentication of records contributed by them as well as those contributed by other institutions.
- 2) Bibliographic Participants - Institutions that are libraries contributing their own current and retrospective cataloging, created with piece(s) in hand, and submitting surrogates to the Centers of Responsibility.
- 3) Union List Participants - Institutions providing data contributed to them by other libraries, usually input with no piece in hand. Authentication of these records is not performed until upgraded by a Bibliographic Participant.

Current participants would be surveyed to ascertain whether they will contribute data as Bibliographic or Union List Participants. Further members would also indicate which category of participation can be expected from them. Qualified participants would be designated by LC or NLC as Centers of Responsibility only after proper consultation with other CONSER participants and CONSER management at OCLC.

With these points in mind, it seems logical that a cooperative program for supplying high quality bibliographic data is possible, and that libraries participating in both CONSER and the name authority program are logical candidates for Center of Responsibility designation. The University of Texas is the only library currently meeting these two criteria, and could serve as a test case. Several other CONSER participants may be participants in the cooperative name authority project soon. In order to help realize the decentralization of authentication, CONSER and the cooperative name authority program should be integrated as much as possible through overlapping participation. Participation in a specific utility should not be considered as a criterion for participation in either program.

3. Adherence to national standards. Ensuring that records created through the CONSER project adhere to national standards is vital to the creation of a national bibliographic data base. There is concern among CONSER participants and other interested parties that there are a number of projects under way which involve conversion of serial records, and that different standards are being followed in each of these projects. At the November 1979 CLR/OE sponsored meeting, attendees agreed that ensuring adherence to standards was of utmost importance, and should be made a criterion in awarding grants under the Higher Education Act Title II-C program and other funding programs. CLR's BSDP Program Committee has recommended that CONSER standards be adopted as requirements for Title II-C awards for serials projects.

4. Governance. When the CONSER program was initiated, the Library of Congress was to take over the project and manage it after the initial period. However, LC was unable to do so and OCLC assumed that function. There is concern that responsibility for this national cooperative venture should not rest with any one utility.

At its meeting on June 27, 1980, prior to the American Library Association Annual Conference in New York, the Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries ("Big Heads") adopted the following resolution:

"Therefore, be it resolved that the national libraries, the academic and research libraries, members of ARL, and those libraries that are engaged in or about to undertake retrospective conversion of serial records projects be urged to encourage their respective networks, affiliates, and/or consortia to:

1. establish, as an immediate priority, an electronic interconnection between their networks that will provide their participants dynamic access to each other's serial data base, provide for file building and dynamic serial data exchange;
2. provide for a more timely distribution of national level (CONSER) serial records; and
3. promote the use of national level (CONSER) serial records through a carefully monitored quality assurance program."

Recommendations

This paper is intended primarily to inform ARL directors about the current issues facing the CONSER project. However, the ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control recommends that ARL, in addition to supporting the principle of linking the bibliographic utilities endorsed by the Membership²:

1. endorse the "Big Heads" resolution presented above;
2. support current efforts at interim solutions for sharing data and encouraging CONSER participation regardless of utility affiliation;
3. support the Library of Congress's plan to decentralize authentication; and
4. study the recommendations from the CLR/OE meeting in November 1979, and consider what further action might be appropriate.³

To the extent that ARL libraries are CONSER participants and/or users of the CONSER data files, we would hope that they work toward achieving these goals.

ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control
Merle Boylan
Joseph Howard
Ake Koel
Joseph Rosenthal
James Govan, Chair

September 29, 1980

References

1. Much of the background information in this paper is taken from CONSER: Conversion of Serials (Columbus, Ohio: OCLC, Inc., 1979)
2. From the "Network Development and Research Libraries; Some Guiding Principles," adopted by the ARL Membership, May 15, 1980, Salt Lake City, Utah.
3. The report of this meeting has been delayed and is no yet available.

Appendix

Participants

The initial participants in the CONSER Project were:

Library of Congress (including NSDP)
National Library of Canada (including ISDS/Canada)
National Library of Medicine
National Agricultural Library
Cornell University
Minnesota Union List of Serials (MINITEX: Minnesota Interlibrary
Telecommunication Exchange)
State Library of New York
State University of New York
University of California Library Automation Project, Berkeley
Yale University

Additional participants, and the dates they joined the Project, are:

University of Florida, Gainesville (Florida Union List of Serials), 1975
Boston Theological Institute, 1975
Harvard University, 1976
U.S. Department of the Interior, 1976
Indiana University, 1979
University of Washington, 1980
University of Texas at Austin, 1980
University of Michigan, 1980
University of California, Los Angeles, 1980

In August 1980 the University of California Library Automation Project in Berkeley withdrew from CONSER membership.

Criteria for CONSER Membership

Because of the importance of the CONSER Project to the library community and the interest of many libraries in participating in the Project, the participants have adopted the following guidelines in considering new members:

1. Uniqueness of collection: special collections minimum overlap (50%).
2. Excellence of bibliographic data: data must conform to national and international standards.
3. Sufficient resources to support participation: qualified and experienced staff; ability to input all current serials cataloging and to provide surrogates; available equipment.
4. System workloads: Can LC and NLC support authentication workloads? Can OCLC support workload?
5. Special contributions: considered on a case-by-case basis.

APPENDIX - G

ATTENDANCE AT 97TH MEMBERSHIP MEETING ARLINGTON, VA. October 15-16, 1980

University of Alabama Libraries Joyce Lamont	Center for Research Libraries Donald B. Simpson
University of Alberta Library Bruce Peel	University of Chicago Library Martin D. Runkle
University of Arizona Library W. David Laird	University of Cincinnati Libraries Charles B. Osburn
Arizona State University Library Donald Riggs	University of Colorado Library Clyde Walton
Boston Public Library Philip J. McNiff	Colorado State University Library Le Moyne W. Anderson
Boston University Library John Laucus	Columbia University Libraries Patricia Battin
Brigham Young University Library Sterling J. Albrecht	University of Connecticut Library John P. McDonald
University of British Columbia Library Basil Stuart-Stubbs	Cornell University Libraries Herbert Finch
Brown University Library C. James Schmidt	Dartmouth College Libraries Margaret A. Otto
University of California, Berkeley Library Joseph Rosenthal	Duke University Libraries Connie Dunlap
University of California, Davis Library Bernard Kreissman	Emory University Library Herbert F. Johnson
University of California, Los Angeles Library Russell Shank	University of Florida Libraries Gustave A. Harrer
University of California, Riverside Library John Tanno	Florida State University Library Charles E. Miller
University of California, San Diego Library Millicent D. Abell	Georgetown University Library Joseph E. Jeffs
University of California, Santa Barbara Library Allen B. Veaner	University of Georgia Libraries David F. Bishop
Case Western Reserve University Libraries James V. Jones	University of Guelph Library Margaret Beckman

Harvard University Library
Y. T. Feng

University of Hawaii Library
Lee Putnam

University of Houston Libraries
Robin Downes

Howard University Libraries
Binford H. Conley

University of Illinois Library
Hugh Atkinson

Indiana University Libraries
Elaine F. Sloan

University of Iowa Libraries
Leslie W. Dunlap

Iowa State University Library
Paul Gherman

John Crerar Library
William S. Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
Susan K. Martin

University of Kansas Library
Margaret Clark

University of Kentucky Libraries
Not represented

Kent State University Libraries
Hyman W. Kritzer

Library of Congress
William Welsh

Linda Hall Library
Thomas D. Gillies

Louisiana State University Library
George Guidry, Jr.

McGill University Library
Marianne Scott

McMaster University Library
Graham R. Hill

University of Maryland Library
H. Joanne Harrar

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Richard Talbot

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libs.
Jay K. Lucker

University of Miami Library
Frank Rodgers

University of Michigan Library
Richard M. Dougherty

Michigan State University Library
Not represented

University of Minnesota Libraries
Eldred Smith

University of Missouri Library
R. Grey Cole

National Agricultural Library
Sam Waters

National Library of Canada
Joseph Guy Sylvestre

National Library of Medicine
Kent Smith

University of Nebraska Libraries
Gerald A. Rudolph

The Newberry Library
Not represented

University of New Mexico Library
Paul Vassallo

New York Public Library
David H. Stam

New York State Library
Joseph F. Shubert

New York University Libraries
Carlton C. Rochell

University of North Carolina Libraries
James F. Govan

Northwestern University Libraries
John P. McGowan

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Robert C. Miller

Ohio State University Libraries
William J. Studer

University of Oklahoma Library
Sul H. Lee

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
George W. Shipman

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Joan Gotwals

Pennsylvania State University Library
Stuart Forth

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Glenora E. Rossell

Princeton University Library
Donald Koepp

Purdue University Library
Joseph M. Dagnese

Queen's University Library
Margot B. McBurney

Rice University Library
Samuel Carrington

University of Rochester Libraries
James F. Wyatt

Rutgers University Library
Hendrik Edelman

University of Saskatchewan Library
Nancy B. Brown

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Robert Maloy

University of South Carolina Library
Kenneth E. Toombs

University of Southern Calif. Library
Roy L. Kidman

Southern Illinois University Library
Kenneth G. Peterson

Stanford University Libraries
Not represented

State University of New York at Albany
Joseph Z. Nitecki

State University of New York at Buffalo
Saktidas Roy

State University of New York at Stony Brook
John B. Smith

Syracuse University Libraries
Donald C. Anthony

Temple University Library
Joseph Boisse

University of Tennessee Libraries
Donald R. Hunt

University of Texas Libraries
Harold W. Billings

Texas A & M University Library
Irene B. Meadley

University of Toronto Libraries
Robert Blackburn

Tulane University Library
William Newman

University of Utah Libraries
Roger K. Hanson

Vanderbilt University Library
Frank P. Grisham

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State Univ.
Thomas Souter

University of Virginia Libraries
Ray Frantz

University of Washington Library
Merle N. Boylan

Washington State University Library
Allene F. Schnaitter

Washington University Libraries
Charles Churchwell

Wayne State University Libraries
Vern M. Pings

University of Western Ontario Library
Robert Lee

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Joseph Treyz

Yale University Libraries
Donald Engley

York University Library
Anne Woodsworth

ATTENDANCE BY THE MEMBERSHIP - NAME INDEX

Abell, Millicent D.
Albrecht, Sterling J.
Anderson, Le Moyne W.
Anthony, Donald C.
Atkinson, Hugh

Battin, Patricia
Beckman, Margaret
Billings, Harold W.
Bishop, David F.
Blackburn, Robert
Boisse, Joseph
Boylan, Merle N.
Brown, Nancy A.
Budington, William S.

Carrington, Samuel
Churchwell, Charles
Clark, Margaret
Coie, R. Grey
Conley, Binford H.

Dagnese, Joseph M.
Dougherty, Richard M.
Downes, Robin
Dunlap, Connie
Dunlap, Leslie W.

Edelman, Hendrik
Engley, Donald

Feng, Y. T.
Finch, Herbert
Forth, Stuart
Frantz, Ray

Gherman, Paul
Gillies, Thomas D.
Gotwals, Joan
Govan, James F.
Grisham, Frank P.
Guidry, George

Hanson, Roger K.
Harrar, H. Joanne
Harrer, Gustave A.

University of California, San Diego Library
Brigham Young University Library
Colorado State University Library
Syracuse University Libraries
University of Illinois Library

Columbia University Libraries
University of Guelph Library
University of Texas Libraries
University of Georgia Libraries
University of Toronto Libraries
Temple University Library
University of Washington Library
University of Saskatchewan Library
John Crerar Library

Rice University Library
Washington University Libraries
University of Kansas Library
University of Missouri Library
Howard University Libraries

Purdue University Library
University of Michigan Library
University of Houston Libraries
Duke University Libraries
University of Iowa Libraries

Rutgers University Library
Yale University Library

Harvard University Library
Cornell University Libraries
Pennsylvania State University Library
University of Virginia Libraries

Iowa State University Library
Linda Hall Library
University of Pennsylvania Libraries
University of North Carolina Libraries
Vanderbilt University Library
Louisiana State University Library

University of Utah Libraries
University of Maryland Library
University of Florida Libraries

Hill, Graham R.
Hoadley, Irene
Hunt, Donald R.

Jeffs, Joseph E.
Johnson, Herbert F.
Jones, James V.

Kidman, Roy L.
Koepp, Donald
Kreissman, Bernard
Kritzer, Hyman W.

Laird, W. David
Lamont, Joyce
Laucus, John
Lee, Robert
Lee, Sul H.
Lucker, Jay K.

McBurney, Margot B.
McDonald, John P.
McGowan, John P.
McNiff, Philip J.
Maloy, Robert
Martin, Susan K.
Miller, Charles E.
Miller, Robert C.

Newman, William
Nitecki, Joseph Z.

Osburn, Charles B.
Otto, Margaret A.

Peel, Bruce
Peterson, Kenneth G.
Pings, Vern M.
Putnam, Lee

Riggs, Donald
Rochell, Carlton C.
Rodgers, Frank
Rosenthal, Joseph
Rossell, Glenora E.
Rouse, Roscoe
Roy, Saktidas
Rudolph, Gerald A.
Runkle, Martin D.

Schmidt, C. James
Schnaitter, Allene F.
Scott, Marianne

McMaster University Library
Texas A&M University Library
University of Tennessee Libraries

Georgetown University Library
Emory University Library
Case Western Reserve University Libraries

University of Southern California Library
Princeton University Library
University of California, Davis Library
Kent State University Libraries

University of Arizona Library
University of Alabama Libraries
Boston University Library
University of Western Ontario Library
University of Oklahoma Library
Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries

Queen's University Library
University of Connecticut Library
Northwestern University Libraries
Boston Public Library
Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Johns Hopkins University Library
Florida State University Library
University of Notre Dame Libraries

Tulane University Library
State University of New York at Albany Libraries

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Dartmouth College Libraries

University of Alberta Library
Southern Illinois University Library
Wayne State University Libraries
University of Hawaii Library

Arizona State University Library
New York University Libraries
University of Miami Library
University of California, Berkeley Library
University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Oklahoma State University Library
State University of New York at Buffalo Libraries
University of Nebraska Libraries
University of Chicago Library

Brown University Library
Washington State University Library
McGill University Library

Shank, Russell
Shipman, George W.
Shubert, Joseph F.
Simpson, Donald B.
Sloan, Elaine F.
Smith, Eldred
Smith, John B.

Smith, Kent
Souter, Thomas
Stam, David H.
Stuart-Stubbs, Basil
Studer, William J.
Sylvestre, Joseph Guy

Talbot, Richard
Tanno, John
Toombs, Kenneth E.
Treyz, Joseph

Vassallo, Paul
Veaner, Allen B.

Walton, Clyde
Waters, Sam
Welsh, William
Woodsworth, Anne
Wyatt James F.

University of California, Los Angeles Library
University of Oregon Library
New York State Library
Center for Research Libraries
Indiana University Libraries
University of Minnesota Libraries
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Library
National Library of Medicine
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
New York Public Library
University of British Columbia Library
Ohio State University Libraries
National Library of Canada

University of Massachusetts Libraries
University of California, Riverside Library
University of South Carolina Library
University of Wisconsin Libraries

University of New Mexico Library
University of California, Santa Barbara Library

University of Colorado Library
National Agricultural Library
Library of Congress
York University Library
University of Rochester Libraries

Guests

Charles Bunge	Association of American Library Schools
Margaret Child	National Endowment for the Humanities
Ralph Conant	Unity College (speaker)
Eileen Cooke	American Library Association
Shirley Echelman	Medical Library Association
Hal Espo	American Library Association/ACRL
Beverlee French	CLR Intern - University of Connecticut
Kathleen Gunning	CLR Intern - University of Wisconsin
Nancy Gwinn	Council on Library Resources
Warren Haas	Council on Library Resources (speaker)
Dick Hays	Department of Education
Joseph Howard	Library of Congress
Lee Jones	Council on Library Resources
Ake Koel	Yale University Library
John Lorenz	
Stephen McCarthy	
Keyes Metcalf	
Kathleen Moretto	CLR Intern - University of North Carolina
James Morris	Andrew Mellon Foundation
Thomas Noble	American Council of Learned Societies
Maxine Reneker	CRL Intern - Columbia University
Charlene Renner	CLR Intern - University of California, Berkeley Library
Vivian Sessions	Grad. School of Lib. Science, McGill University
Henry Snyder	ESTC/NA, Louisiana State University
Robert Stueart	School of Library Science, Simmons College (speaker)
Elizabeth Stone	Graduate Department of Library & Information Science, Catholic University
Barbara Turlington	Association of American Universities
Robert Vosper	Graduate School of Library & Information Science, University of California, Los Angeles
Robert Warner	National Archives and Records Service (speaker)
Robert Wedgeworth	American Library Association

ARL Staff

Ralph E. McCoy, Interim Executive Director
Carol A. Mandel, Associate Executive Director
Nicola Daval, Information Officer
Duane E. Webster, Director, Office of Management Studies
Jeffrey J. Gardner, Associate, Office of Management Studies
Maureen S. Schechter, Training Program Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Maxine Sitts, Information Services Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Pamela Darling, Preservation Specialist, Office of Management Studies

APPENDIX - H

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICERS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

OCTOBER 1980

ARL OFFICERS AND BOARD FOR 1979/1980

Connie Dunlap, President
Jay K. Lucker, Vice President & President-Elect
Le Moyne W. Anderson, Past President
Millicent D. Abell (Oct. 1982)
Charles Churchwell (Oct. 1982)
Richard M. Dougherty (Oct. 1980)
Frank P. Grisham (Oct. 1980)
Irene B. Hoadley (Oct. 1981)
Margot B. McBurney (Oct. 1981)
Eldred Smith (Oct. 1982)
James F. Wyatt (Oct. 1981)

STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on ARL Statistics

Kendon Stubbs, University of Virginia (1982)
Anne Woodsworth (1982)
Richard J. Talbot, Chairman (1982)

Committee on Foreign Newspapers on Microfilm

Gustave A. Harrer (1980)
Bruce Peel (1980)
Gordon R. Williams (1980)
Joseph E. Jeffs, Chairman (1980)

Committee on Interlibrary Loan

H. Gordon Bechanan (1980)
Susan K. Martin (1982)
Glenora E. Rossell (1982)
Jay K. Lucker (1980)
Kenneth G. Peterson, Chairman (1981)

Committee on Membership (Ad Hoc)

ARL Executive Committee

Committee on a National Periodicals System

Richard De Gennaro (1980)
John P. McDonald (1980)
Peter Paulson, N.Y. State Library (1981)
Allen B. Veaner (1980)
James Schmidt, Chairman (1980)

Committee on Nominations

ARL Vice President, Chairman

Committee on Preservation of Research Libraries Materials

James F. Govan (1981)
Joanne Harrar (1981)
David Laird (1982)
Joel L. Samuels (1982)
David H. Stam, Chairman (1982)

ARL COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN ACQUISITIONS

Africa

Peter Duignan, Hoover Institution of War, Peace, and Revolution
J.M.D. Crossey, Yale University
Esther J. Walls, SUNY Stony Brook
Julian Witherell, Library of Congress
Hans Panofsky, Northwestern University, Chairman

Middle East

George N. Atiyeh, Library of Congress
James Pollack, University of Indiana
David H. Partington, Harvard University, Chairman

Eastern Europe

Nina Lencek, Columbia University
Laurence Miller, University of Illinois
Joseph A Placek, University of Michigan
Anna Stuliglowa, Cornell University
Wojciech Zalewski, Stanford University
David H. Kraus, Library of Congress, Chairman

East Asia

Weying Wan, University of Michigan
Eugene Wu, Harvard University
Warren Tsuneishi, Library of Congress, Chairman

South Asia

Paul Fasana, New York Public Library
Maureen Patterson, University of Chicago
Louis A. Jacob, Library of Congress, Chairman

Southeast Asia

Charles Bryant, Yale University
John Musgrave, University of Michigan

Latin America

Nettie Lee Benson, University of Texas
Donald Wisdom, Library of Congress
Carl W. Deal, University of Illinois, Chairman

Western Europe

Norman Dudley, University of California at Los Angeles
Ten-Tsai Feng, Boston Public Library
Howard Sullivan, Wayne State University, Chairman

ARL TASK FORCES

Task Force on Bibliographic Control (1980)

Merle N. Boylan
Joseph H. Howard, Library of Congress
Ake I. Koel, Yale University
Joseph Rosenthal
James F. Govan, Chairman
Richard M. Dougherty (liaison with T.F. on Nat. Lib. Network Development)

Task Force on Library Education (1982)

Stuart Forth
Irene B. Hoadley
Herbert Johnson
James Ranz
Margot B. McBurney, Chairman

Task Force on ARL Membership Criteria (1980)

William J. Studer
James F. Wyatt
Jay K. Lucker, Chairman
Richard J. Talbot (liaison with T.F. on ARL Statistics)

Task Force on National Library Network Development (1980)

Hugh C. Atkinson
Patricia Battin
William J. Studer
William J. Welsh
Richard M. Dougherty, Chairman

Advisory Committee, Bibliographic Control of Materials in Microform - Planning Grant

Robert Grey Cole, University of Missouri-Columbia
Richard M. Dougherty
Linda Hamilton, University Microfilms International
Alan Meckler, Microform Review, Inc.
Susan Severtson, Research Publications, Inc.
Basil Stuart-Stubbs
Allen B. Veaner, Chairman

REPRESENTATIVES

ALA Committee on Cataloging:

Description and Access. Carol Mandel
ALA Interlibrary Loan Committee Jay Lucker
ALA Joint Statistics Coordinating Committee . . . Carol Mandel
ANSI Committee Z39. Ralph McCoy
CONSER Advisory Group Carol Mandel
Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue. Ray Franz
Joint Committee on Union List of Serials William Budington
LC Bibliographic Advisory Committee James Govan
LC Cataloging in Publication Advisory Group Carol Mandel
LC Network Advisory Committee Richard Dougherty
Society of American Archivists. C. Herbert Finch, Cornell
Universal Serials & Book Exchange Joanne Harrar

CENTER FOR CHINESE RESEARCH MATERIALS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Roy Hofheinz, Jr., Harvard University
Ying-mao Kau, Brown University
David T. Roy, University of Chicago
Weiying Wan, University of Michigan
Eugene Wu, Harvard University
Philip J. McNiff, Chairman

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Millicent D. Abell
Page Ackerman, UCLA Graduate School of Library and Information Science
Frank P. Grisham
Louis E. Martin
William J. Studer
Irene B. Hoadley, Chairman

APPENDIX - I

MEMBERSHIP LIST
OCTOBER 1980

University of Alabama Libraries
P.O. Box S
University, Alabama 35486
Malcolm McDonald, Interim Director
of Libraries
(205) 348-5298

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2JB
Bruce Peel, Libn. to the Univ.
(403) 432-3790

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
W. David Laird, Librarian
(602) 626-2101

Arizona State University Library
Tempe, Arizona 85281
Donald Riggs, Libn.
(602) 965-3416

Boston Public Library
Copley Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Philip J. McNiff, Librarian
(617) 536-5400

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director
(617) 353-3710

Brigham Young University Library
324 Lee Library
Provo, Utah 84602
Sterling J. Albrecht, Director
(801) 378-2905

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1W5
Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Librarian
(604) 228-2298

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
C. James Schmidt, Librarian
(401) 863-2162

University of California, Berkeley Library
Berkeley, California 94720
Joseph Rosenthal, Director
(415) 642-3773

University of California, Davis Library
Davis, California 95616
Bernard Kreissman, Librarian
(916) 752-2110

University of California, Los Angeles Library
Los Angeles, California 90024
Russell Shank, Librarian
(213) 825-1201

University of California, Riverside Library
P.O. Box 5900
Riverside, California 92507
John Tanno, Acting Univ. Libn.
(714) 787-3221

University of California, San Diego
The University Library
La Jolla, California 92037
Munificent D. Abell, Librarian
(714) 452-3061

University of California, Santa Barbara
The University Library
Santa Barbara, California 93106
Allen B. Veaner, Librarian
(805) 961-3256

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
James V. Jones, Director
(216) 368-2990

Center for Research Libraries
5721 Cottage Grove Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Donald B. Simpson, Director
(312) 955-4545

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Martin D. Runkle, Director
(312) 753-2933

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Charles B. Osburn, Vice Provost
for Univ. Libraries
(513) 475-2218

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80309
Clyde Walton, Director
(303) 492-7511

Colorado State University Library
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
Le Moyne W. Anderson, Director
(303) 491-5911

Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York 10027
Patricia Battin, Vice Pres.
& Univ. Libn.
(212) 280-2247

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
John P. McDonald, Director
(203) 486-2219

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
Louis E. Martin, Univ. Libn.
(607) 256-3689

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Margaret A. Otto, Libn.
(603) 646-2235

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Connie Dunlap, Librarian
(919) 684-2034

Emory University Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
Herbert F. Johnson, Director
(404) 329-6861

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director
(904) 392-0341

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Charles E. Miller, Director
(904) 644-5211

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D.C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director
(202) 625-4095

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
David Bishop, Director
(404) 542-2716

University of Guelph Library
Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1G 2W1
Margaret Beckman, Chief Libn.
(519) 824-4120

Harvard University Library
Wadsworth House
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Oscar Handlin, Director
(617) 495-2401

University of Hawaii Library
2550 The Mall
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Don L. Bosseau, Director
(808) 948-7205

University of Houston Libraries
Houston, Texas 77004
Robin Downes, Director
(713) 749-2340

Howard University Libraries
Washington, D.C. 20001
Binford H. Conley, Director
(202) 636-7234

University of Illinois Library
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Hugh C. Atkinson, Director
(217) 333-0790

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47401
Elaine F. Sloan, Dean of Univ. Librs.
(812) 337-3404

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Leslie W. Dunlap, Dean of Lib. Admin.
(319) 353-4450

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50011
Warren B. Kuhn, Dean of Lib. Services
(515) 294-1442

John Crerar Library
Chicago, Illinois 60616
William S. Budington, Director
(312) 225-2526

Johns Hopkins University Library
The Milton S. Eisenhower Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Susan K. Martin, Libn.
(301) 338-8325

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
James Ranz, Dean of Libraries
(913) 864-3601

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Paul A. Willis, Director
(606) 257-3801

Kent State University Libraries
Kent, Ohio 44242
Hyman W. Kritzer, Assistant Provost &
Director of Libraries
(216) 672-2962

Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540
Daniel J. Boorstin, Librarian
(202) 287-5205

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Thomas D. Gillies, Director
(816) 363-4600

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
George Guidry, Jr., Director
(504) 388-2217

McGill University Library
3459 McTavish Street
Montreal, Canada H3A 1Y1
Marianne Scott, Director
(514) 392-4049

McMaster University Library
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L8S 4L6
Graham R. Hill, University Librarian
(416) 525-9140 Local 4359

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
H. Joanne Harrar, Librarian
(301) 454-3011

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
Richard J. Talbot, Director
(413) 245-0284

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libs.
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Jay K. Lucker, Director
(617) 253-5651

University of Miami Library
P.O. Box 248214
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
Frank Rodgers, Director
(305) 284-3551

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
Richard M. Dougherty, Director
(313) 764-9356

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard E. Chapin, Director
(517) 355-2341

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Eldred Smith, Director
(612) 373-3097

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65201
John Gribbin, Director
(314) 882-4701

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Richard A. Farley, Director
(301) 344-4248

National Library of Canada
385 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1A 0N4
Joseph Guy Sylvestre, Librarian
(613) 996-1623

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Martin M. Cummings, Director
(301) 496-6221

University of Nebraska Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Gerald A. Rudolph, Dean of Libraries
(402) 472-7211

The Newberry Library
60 West Walton Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610
Joel L. Samuels, Dir. of Lib. Sers.
(312) 943-9090

The University of New Mexico
General Library
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131
Paul Vassallo, Dean of Lib. Sers.
(505) 277-4241

New York Public Library
Fifth Avenue at 42nd Street
New York, New York 10018
David H. Stam, Director of the
Research Libraries
(212) 790-6507

New York State Library
Cultural Education Center
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12234
Joseph F. Shubert, State Librarian
(518) 474-5930

New York University Libraries
New York, New York 10003
Carlton C. Rochell, Dean of Libraries
(212) 598-7676

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
James F. Govan, Director
(919) 933-1301

Northwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60210
John P. McGowan, Librarian
(312) 492-7640

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
Robert C. Miller, Librarian
(219) 283-4674

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
William J. Studer, Director
(614) 422-4241

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
Sul H. Lee, Director
(405) 325-2611 or 2614

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078
Roscoe Rouse, Dean of Lib. Ser.
(405) 624-6321

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
George W. Shipman, Univ. Libn.
(503) 686-3056

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
Richard De Gennaro, Director
(215) 243-7091

Pennsylvania State University Library
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Stuart Forth, Dean of Univ. Libraries
(814) 865-0401

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Glenora Edwards Rossell, Director
(412) 624-4401

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Donald Koepf, Director
(609) 452-3170

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Joseph M. Dagnese, Director
(317) 749-2571

Queen's University
Douglas Library
Kingston, Canada K7L 5C4
Margot B. McBurney, Chief Libn.
(613) 547-5950

Rice University Library
6100 S. Main, Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77001
Samuel Carrington, Director
(713) 527-4022

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
James F. Wyatt, Director
(716) 275-4463

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Henrik Edelman, Univ. Libn.
(201) 932-7505

University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Canada S7N 0W0
Nancy A. Brown, Univ. Libn.
and Director of Libraries
(306) 343-4216

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Constitution Avenue at 10th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560
Robert Maloy, Director
(202) 357-2240

University of South Carolina Libraries
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
Kenneth E. Toombs, Director of Libs.
(803) 777-3142

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Roy L. Kidman, Librarian
(213) 743-2543

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Kenneth G. Peterson, Dean of
Library Affairs
(618) 453-2522

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director
(415) 497-2016

State University of New York at Albany
Libraries
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222
Joseph Z. Nitecki, Director
(518) 457-8540

State University of New York at Buffalo
Libraries
Buffalo, New York 14214
Saktidas Roy, Director
(716) 636-2965

State University of New York at Stony Brook
Library
Stony Brook, New York 11794
John B. Smith, Director & Dean of Lib.
(516) 246-5650

Syracuse University Libraries
Syracuse, New York 13210
Donald C. Anthony, Director
(315) 423-2574

Temple University Library
Paley Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Joseph A. Boisse, Director
(215) 787-8231

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Donald R. Hunt, Director
(615) 974-4127

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Harold W. Billings, Director
(512) 471-3811

Texas A&M University Library
College Station, Texas 77843
Irene B. Hoadley, Director
(713) 845-6111

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto, Ont., Canada M5S 1A5
Robert Blackburn, Director
(416) 978-2292

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
William Newman, Director
(504) 865-5131

University of Utah Libraries
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Roger K. Hanson, Director
(801) 581-8558

Vanderbilt University Library
419 21st Avenue South
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Frank P. Grisham, Director
(615) 322-2834

Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State
University Libraries
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
H. Gordon Bechanan, Director of Libs.
(703) 961-5593

University of Virginia
Alderman Library
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901
Ray Frantz, Jr., Librarian
(804) 924-3026 or 7849

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98105
Merle N. Boylan, Director
(206) 543-1760

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
Allene F. Schnaitter, Director
(509) 335-4557

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
Charles Churchwell, Librarian
(314) 889-5400

Wayne State University Libraries
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Vern M. Pings, Director
(313) 577-4020

University of Western Ontario Libraries
London 72, Canada
Robert Lee, Director of Libs.
(519) 679-3165

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr., Director
(608) 262-3521

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian
(203) 436-2456

York University Library
4700 Keele Street
Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3J 2R2
Anne Woodsworth, Director
(416) 667-2235